The Journal of Historical Review

THIS ISSUE

Letters to the Editor

Holocaust Psychohistory

The Faurisson Affair

Vinnytsia

Justice for Palestine: A Libertarian View

Early British Nationalism and Socialism

Auschwitz Notebook

ALSO

Book Reviews

Revisionist Announcements

Volume One, Number Four Winter 1980

CONTENTS

A Note from the Editor 292
Lewis Brandon

Letters to the Editor 297

The Holocaust, and the Myth of the Past as History 309
Dr. Howard F. Stein

The Faurisson Affair 323
Dr. Arthur R. Butz

Vinnytsia — The Katyn of Ukraine 335
M. Seleshko

Palestine: Liberty and Justice 349
Samuel Edward Konkin III

Nationalism, Racialism and Early British Socialism 355
Richard Lawson

Auschwitz Notebook 365
Ditlieb Felderer

Book Reviews 371

About the Contributors 381

A Note From the Editor

This issue, we are extremely pleased to welcome onto our Editorial Advisory Committee three very distinguished academics. Thomas Henry Irwin is a graduate of Western Kentucky University, and has taught at Ohio State University. He is now pursuing a law degree at University of Kentucky. Richard Verrall is a History graduate from University of London, and now edits the *New Nation* quarterly magazine (73 Great Eastern Street, London EC1) which has a special Revisionist feature each issue. Dr. Wilhelm Stäglich served his country at an anti-aircraft installation near Oswieçim (Auschwitz) in German-occupied Poland. After the war, he became a federal judge at Hamburg. However, due to his outspoken skepticism of the "Holocaust" notion -- in particular regarding Auschwitz -- he was retired early. He later had his pension reduced as a further inducement to remain silent. His recently published book *Der Auschwitz Mythos (The Auschwitz Myth)* has been confiscated by the West German authorities; stock, artwork and printing plates.

Our 1980 Revisionist Convention was held at Pomona College, Claremont, California, and was an even greater success than our first venture in 1979. 110 people attended, and heard speakers from all around the world debunk many Indisputable Historical Truths. A full report appeared in *The Spotlight* and the *National Educator*. The highlight of the Convention was the announcement of the results of the $50,000 reward for proof of the Holocaust. There had not been a single claimant, so henceforth the reward would be divided into two. We will award $25,000 to anyone who can prove the *The Diary of Anne Frank* is authentic, and $25,000 to anyone who can prove -- by forensic means preferably -- that the Germans turned Jews into bars of soap. Claim forms are available from this office, though it is unfortunate that Otto Frank died before we could send him one. The papers which were presented at the 1980 Convention will be appearing in the next two issues of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW. The 1981 Convention is provisionally scheduled for 20-23 November.

I am sorry to announce that the planned European Revisionist Tour for next summer has had to be indefinitely postponed, due to insufficient bookings. I would advise all those anxious to visit Poland to contact: Ditlieb Felderer, Marknadsvagen 289, S-183 34 Täby, Sweden. Mr. Felderer organizes minibus tours every summer where the itinerary is more flexible.

I note from my September issue of *Response*, the publication of the Los Angeles based Simon Wiesenthal Center for Holocaust Studies, that staff changes are under way. Efraim Zuroff, the Director, is to return to Israel were he will work for the U.S. Government's War Crimes Investigation office. However, it is unlikely that he will be investigating such Holocaust luminaries as Simon Wiesenthal, who was a collaborator with the Nazis, according to the Austrian (Jewish) Chancellor Bruno Kreisky. His place is to be taken in Los Angeles by Alex Grobman, who has been studying at the Yad Vashem Center and the Hebrew University in Israel. With such heavy traffic back and forth between Israel and southern California, one wonders how long it will be before the airlines start a shuttle service! Local readers will of course recall the run-in I had on the air with Mr. Zuroff on a radio program earlier this year. Zuroff was also the most strident Zionist to call for the dismissal of Dr. Reinhard Buchner from the faculty of California State University, for the "crime" of disagreeing with the Zionist analysis of WW II history. In the latest issue of *Response*, Zuroff describes our JOURNAL as "slick-looking" and containing articles by "academicians." (Could he be mixing up "academics" with the Soviet jargon?)

I note from a feature in the *Wall Street Journal* of 31 July 1980 that the LA center is financed entirely by the Belzberg brothers of Vancouver, Canada. Starting with a used furniture store in Calgary, the three brothers -- Samuel, William and Hyman -- now have holdings throughout North America valued at $500 million (personal) and $3 billion (corporate). The article reports: "The family fortune is one of the best kept secrets in Canada."

Naturally, the Belzbergs like to keep control of their stockholdings, and the Wiesenthal Center is no exception. Samuel is Chairman of the Board of Trustees; William is also on the

Board; and a Leslie (son?) is on the full-time staff of eleven -- just to make sure that things are run in the family style ("shy but shrewd" according to the business paper). The three brothers and their wives are also "Wiesenthal Fellows," along with other such upright pillars of society as Frank Sinatra. The Belzbergs also have enough cash left over from this philanthropy to finance the Dystonia Medical Foundation, also in Los Angeles. Dystonia is a rare neurological disease which afflicts only Jews. (Samuel Belzberg's eldest daughter is a victim.)

Los Angeles is of course fortunate in having not one but two Holocaust Museums, within a mile or two of each other. One is in the aforementioned Wiesenthal Center, and the other is on the sixth floor of the Anti-Defamation League building. Could it perhaps be that there is some rivalry in the Exterminationist camp, which prevents presenting a broad front?

The ADL -- an illegal organization because it represents Israel and yet is not registered as a foreign agent *à la* Billy Carter -- has been up to its usual tactics in policing American thought. They too wrote to California State University to demand action against our Dr. Buchner, but they were not so clumsy as Zuroff in demanding Buchner's dismissal. They merely wanted him "censured." The university refused to do any such thing.

However, The ADL were more successful with smaller fry. They were able to pressure the San Diego Opera Association into dropping its proposed visit to Oberammergau, despite the opera buffs' original kiting of the Passion Play as "one of the most internationally celebrated events in the world." After "representations" from the ADL, the President of the Association suddenly announced that he had not been "aware of the anti-Semitic content of the play," and that the stopover would be cancelled. One wonders how a man can get to be President of an opera association without knowing the content of the various productions! I wonder if any Italian groups have been upset because the play depicts the Romans as being responsible for the Crucifixion also?

Another edict from the ADL to the federal government was

immediately put into effect to stop U.S. army bases in West Germany from organizing visits to the play. One wonders how long it will be before the ADL insists that the New Testament is revised, on account of its content. The Passion Play is based on the Christian gospels.

The ADLers were also involved in demanding that the Organization of American Historians apologize for renting us their mailing-list, which they meekly did in their July *Newsletter*. At the Fall meeting of the OAH Executive, the secretary Prof. Richard S. Kirkendall reported that he was already feverishly at work with a rebuttal of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW, Volume One, Number One, and he would present his critique to the Board and in the *Newsletter*. Kirkendall's appraisal would be developed "by qualified historians, focus on the credentials of the contributors, and the use of evidence." One can only speculate as to the background of the "qualified historians" on Kirkendall's team. We can be sure of one thing at least: the historians will have been "qualified" by the ADL before pen is put to paper.

Readers may like to know that a critique of the first issue of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW, has already appeared in *The Jewish News* of New Jersey, dated 4 September 1980. The author is Rabbi Wallace Greene, who holds a Ph.D. in Jewish History from Yeshiva University, New York. The "rejoinder" goes on for six pages.

It is not thought likely that the ADL will be joining in on our postcard campaign for freedom of speech in West Germany. We were so impressed with the ADL/Wiesenthal Center postcard campaign to have the German Statute of Limitations extended that we decided to publish our own postcards. They are addressed to Chancellor Schmidt and politely but firmly request that West Germany stop seizing Revisionist books in that country, otherwise the Chancellor would be "called to the bar of world opinion to account for this" suppression of free speech. Samples are available free from this office; further supplies cost $10 per 100 cards. The ADL is much too busy presenting its hilarious "Freedom of Press Award" to the porn king Hugh Hefner. (The award was fol-

Letters to the Editor

11 September 1980

Dear Mr. Brandon,

As a reader of five to twenty-five books a year (almost none of which are to be found in public libraries), historical Revisionism is the brightest star on my horizon!

It is indeed sickening to see what comes out of our so-called "educational" system, and downright revolting to discover the reasons for such decay.

Of the six indignant letters to the editor printed in the Fall, 1980 *Journal*, four are typical of the reaction one can expect from brainwashed nincompoops. The other two aren't any more enlightening, but I will comment as follows:

David Gold, you mention "expertise." The Holocaust myth was not the product of expertise, but depended upon the ignorance and apathy of the people who fell for it. Any five-year-old can see through the asinine drivel known as "The Gerstein Statement." And those fake photographs? Too crude to believe! Not to mention the "confessions." Mr. Gold, you should know that the spirit of Henry Ford, Sr. lives on!

Mr. Lapides, I hope you do let your poor, unfortunate students see *The Journal of Historical Review!* Perhaps that will provide the spark which will inspire them to search for the truth, which they will get precious little of at the University of Bridgeport or any other for that matter.

Mr. Brandon, you and the IHR are doing a wonderful job!

Sincerely,

Mason Armstrong
Clements, MD 20624

12 September 1980

Dear Mr. Brandon:

Several comments are in order regarding the Fall 1980 issue of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW.

1. The sample letters published from various academics are tragic examples of the four decades of historical blackout and "smotherout" to which we have been subjected. Obviously Revisionists have a long way to go before this thick fog of ignorance is penetrated. Your reprinting of Harry Elmer Barnes' "The Public Stake in Revisionism" is a welcome effort in setting forth the Revisionist approach as bona fide and historically valid and not as simply an exercise in pro-Nazi or anti-Semitic propaganda.

2. As you state in your review of *Oradour* by Philip Beck "Our WWII Revisionism is not to rehabilitate National Socialism, but to rehabilitate truth. And the simple truth is that in wartime, atrocities are committed on all sides; the winning side and the losing side."

3. The attempts to link Revisionism and anti-Semitism are deplorable. Obviously such historians and publicists as Harry Elmer Barnes, James J. Martin, Murray N. Rothbard, Frank Chodorov, Clyde R. Miller to list just a few representative names are not anti-Semitic or pro-Nazi.

4. The truth is tragic enough without any further embellishments. Jews perished in the typhus epidemics, families were separated, executions took place. There was a "holocaust." The question is, "What was the nature of the holocaust?" Not a day goes by without the announcement of a new publication, both fiction and non-fiction on the holocaust, in a sickening commercialization of a tragedy of history. Little effort is made to search for the real causes of war and how to prevent holocausts of the future, which lie in the radical alteration of the world economic system.

Sincerely,

Bezalel Chaim
The Revisionist Press
GPO Box 2009
Brooklyn, NY 11202

13 September 1980

Dear Sir:

As an erstwhile member of U.S. army intelligence of Majority ethnic descent, I applaud the efforts of the courageous authors who have contributed to *The Journal of Historical Review*. Most members of the Dispossessed Majority, as it has aptly been called, have all too long been content to let the propaganda myths of World War II go unchallenged; myths unscrupulously promulgated for purposes of political expediency with no regard for the real welfare of the Republic. The results of World War II continue to be very much with us in various forms and as burdens on the American taxpayers. The continued Communist domination of eastern Europe and the hostility of the Islamic nations toward us as a result of our unwavering support of the Zionist state in Palestine are examples of the terrible moral and economic burdens which Americans must bear as a result of what the myths helped to bring about. Late though the hour might be, it is still appropriate to reexamine the myths that caused and continue to cause us so much grief.

Sincerley yours,

Charles E. Weber, Ph.D.
Faculty of Letters
The University of Tulsa
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104

30 September 1980

Dear Mr. Brandon:

Thank you for a most interesting publication, THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW. The machinations of the international money manipulators and the role they play in history certainly needs to be exposed. My only disagreement with you is that you seem to feel these manipulators are solely Jewish, whereas I believe they belong to various groups.

Please spend more time exposing the fact that all governments are plutocracies and less time with prisoner-of-war camps. This may be of interest to a specialized group, but historical revision is

too broad a subject to be narrowed in this fashion. If all money manipulators are not Jewish, then removing sympathy from the Jews by debunking the WWII genocide myth will not effectively oppose money manipulation. Please have more articles on economics, showing how these manipulations work.

Again, thank you for a very interesting publication.

Joe Baumhaft,
Oklahoma State University

17 July 1980

Dear Mr. Brandon,

Thank you for yours of 7 July, which I found fascinating, not least because of your references to heretic-burning at Salzburg, Lewes, and in Spain, and the mobs who persecuted Copernicus, Darwin, Galileo, da Vinci, and poor old Columbus.

I should have thought that you, above all others, would have realized by now that these myths are the result of a massive historical confidence trick designed to discredit true defenders of high civilization. The fires of the Inquisition were, in fact, folk festivals mainly given over the marshmallow-roasting. Some heretics, it is true, were injured during these revels, but only because they shared with moths a fatal fascination for light. As for Copernicus, Galileo, and da Vinci, they were all implicated in a massive chain-letter swindle, considering which they got off fairly lightly. Columbus was actually a double agent for the Aztecs, and was the real origin of the raffish phrase 'Montezuma's revenge.' And Darwin was really a simian in disguise; his theory on the origins of species was thus merely an extended exercise in social climbing. Polite Englishmen of his day saw through this, but typically they did not mob him; rather he was excluded from the best clubs.

I have done much research on these and other evidences of the ages-old liberal-rationalist plot to discredit such exemplars of true humanity as Torquemada and Judge Jeffreys, but I can't find anyone in the anti-intellectual liberal establishment to publish them. Perhaps you could point me in the way of finding some funds to

subsidize publication of these essential findings?

Actually, I'm a product of the American educational system, so you had better add it to your list of fallen angels.

Yours sincerely,

Robert M. Bliss
University of Lancaster
England

October 1980

Dear Lewis:

A magazine which may be of interest to those who read German is *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gengenwart* (Germany Past and Present). Now in its 27th year, the attractive journal is published quarterly by the Grabert Verlag of Tübingen, the publisher of important works such as *Der Erzwungene Krieg* by David Hoggan, *Der Auschwitz Mythos* by Wilhelm Stäglich, as well as the German editions of Yockey's *Imperium* and Rassinier's *The Drama of the European Jews*. The recent issues I have were sent to me by Dr. Stäglich, a regular contributor who was forced into early retirement for writing several articles questioning the "holocaust" legend.

Wilfried von Oven, once personal press consultant to Dr. Goebbels and author of the gripping memoir *Finale Furioso*, serves as editor in chief of the (self-described) "journal for politics and cultural -- and intellectual -- history."

Each issue runs 32 to 40 pages and contains seven or eight major articles as well as several book reviews and a page of short news items. The format is similar to that of *Instauration*. Subscriptions from the United States cost DM 21 (about $12.50) per year and may be ordered from: Grabert Verlag, Postfach 1629, D-7400 Tübingen 1, West Germany.

Among other well-written articles, the latest issue contains a critical piece by Wilhelm Stäglich about the widely publicized Auschwitz aerial photos, and a review of a "Cholly Bilderberger" essay from *Instauration*.

The issue also contains an article by American historian David L. Hoggan on the background to Hitler's attack against Soviet Russia in 1941.

Hoggan's brilliant Harvard doctoral dissertation was considerably expanded to become *Der Erzwungene Krieg* (The Forced War). The book, now in its tenth edition, has earned a place as the standard work on the origins of the Second World War.

The Grabert Verlag has just announced the publication of a two-volume work by Dr. Hoggan entitled *Das Blinde Jahrhundert* (The Blind Century), the Californian's fourth major work. Volume one, released last October, is *Amerika -- Das messianische Unheil* (America -- The Messianic Calamity). The second part, *Europa -- Die verlorene Weltmitte* (Europe -- The Lost World Center) is expected to appear late next year.

Harry Elmer Barnes called the appearance of Hoggan's *Erzwungene Krieg* in 1961 "an epoch-making event in post-war historiography" which "destroyed for all time the fiction of Germany's exclusive responsibility for the outbreak of war in 1939."

The appearance of important books by Hoggan, Arthur Butz, David Irving, A.J.P. Taylor, and others, has begun an inexorable process in revising the emotional and hate-filled "historiography" of the victors of 1945. Tremendous progress has been made recently in replacing the politically self-serving and highly tendentious writing of authors like William Shirer with something approximating the ever-elusive truth.

David Hoggan concludes his article for the last issue of *Deutschland in Geschichte und Gegenwart* with an admonition that could have come from the pen of the great Leopold von Ranke himself:

"Prejudice and emotion have no place in the search for historical truth. That effort demands hard work involving concrete facts and source materials. The result of such research work must be able to absolutely speak for itself, free from political considerations of any kind."

Mark Weber
Washington, DC

8 September 1980

Dear Mr. Brandon,

If your letter was a sample of the kind of thinking that goes into your work at the Institute for Historical Review, then I think that to call your journal a "rag" was elevating it too highly. Your letter of 25 August 1980 (*The Christian News*, 8 September 1980, page 13),

is distorted and filled with errors.

I have nothing to lose in investigating history to find out the truth, and have no objection to your doing the same. What I object to is that you do not do this. You instead destroy history by publishing opinions that are clearly false and misunderstanding the past, and by becoming an apologist for the errors of Nazism.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, President of the United States, 1933-1945, was not trying to get America into World War Two. He saw the rise of Nazism and the dangers it presaged, and understood that at some time this would lead the United States into war against Germany. But this might be prevented, if Hitler could be stopped, and Roosevelt did what he could to do just that. It is a complete misunderstanding of history to claim that Roosevelt's desire to get us into war led to Japan's attack on us at Pearl Harbor. Of course the Japanese insisted that we caused the war by forcing them to fight us. Of course, if we had given in to their urging, and let them go on as they wanted, they might not have gone to war against us at that time. Does our resistance make us the responsibile party?

If the American people were dead against war, why did Congress support Roosevelt's actions, support the draft (pre-war), and finally vote war by an immense majority? Why did those men get re-elected?

What were Roosevelt's "covert . . . machinations"? I thought that his acts in the late 1930's and early 1940's were quite open. What did he do in secret? In what was he lying? You accused him of "mendacious machinations" but this is false rhetoric. Most of his activities were open and truthful, even if you happen to disagree with them, or with their results.

You seem to think the Neutrality Act forbade the President from keeping oil and metal from being shipped to Japan. Would you please cite the section of the law that forbade this?

Further, why should the President of the United States be required to allow sales of oil and metal to a country that is going to use these things against us?

What sort of political power to act for the good of the country would you allow to a President? What are the limits of action in foreign policy for any nation? Can you show that these activities by the United States were in fact aimed only at starting a war, and not at lesser goals? What purposes are proper for any foreign policy?

Would you allow the threat of war, by any power, to stop your country from the exercise of any economic policies short of war?

I think your point of view, and your idea of foreign policy, are stupid and self-contradictory. They are, I feel, caused only by your desire to make points against Roosevelt, and not upon the histori-

cal facts involved, nor upon any reasoned view of foreign policy and the constitutional limits of the American presidency.

HOW MANY DIED IN THE HOLOCAUST?

No one that I know has argued that all of the six million Jews who died in the Holocaust, nor the millions of others killed by the deliberate action of Germans and other Nazis, under the leadership of Hitler in World War II, were all killed in concentration camps. Many thousands were killed in Russia by extermination groups. Others were slaughtered in the midst of the Warsaw insurrection.

Your figure of 350,000 (inexplicably reduced to 35,000 by the typists of the *Christian News*), is most probably the list of those persons who died in these camps, and were identified. It excludes the "death camps," where millions died, and probably excludes those not personally identified. Do you claim that the Red Cross verified that only 350,000 persons in all in the whole of World War II [died] in the concentration camps of all kinds?

Even during World War II it was known that millions of Jews were being killed by the Germans. In December 1942 Rabbi Stephen Wise wrote to President Roosevelt to tell him of the mass massacres. Other sources of information verified this, but the news was so appalling that few could believe them, and they demanded more proof.

In August 1943 the *New York Times* reported on the organized murder by the Germans of 1.7 million persons, and the starvation deaths of 750,000 others. Others among Hitler's associates helped to reveal the truth, as in the work of SS Officer Gerstein and of those who brought the news to the Vatican.

But in the midst of war we could not bribe Hitler or negotiate with him, and it meant that we had few ways to deal with the terror Hitler had launched upon innocent civilians. Thus we could only look on in horror as the death camps murdered thousands of victims every month.

I have no objection to any attempt to verify the exact number of Jews and others who were killed by Hitler and the Germans in World War II. I know that we must estimate the numbers because some of the records of the German killers were lost, but skillful reconstruction can help us to arrive at a good figure.

We are now dealing with deliberate killing. This excludes deaths by disease or starvation, or those who died fighting in or against the Germans under arms. Prisoners in concentration camps sometimes died because they were maltreated or given too little food, and their hearts gave out. We are even willing not to count them.

We include Jews burned to death in synagogues or asphyxiated in the panel vans or machine gunned to death beside trenches. We include those who were gassed in the death camps, or deprived of oxygen for the purpose of killing them. We include those human beings, babies to grandmothers, who were stripped nude and killed, and whose corpses were then examined to make sure their gold fillings were extracted.

We know of the many gold fillings and gold eyeglasses that poured into private Gestapo and SS accounts in Berlin, until they overflowed the warehouse room available for them. We know of the evidence given by some of the death merchants themselves, and of other witnesses.

We know some of the mechanics of the death camps, and how they were built. We have the estimates of the builders as to how much gas to use, and how to use it. We know some of the statistics here, and from them we can extrapolate as to the probable number killed.

I think six million is a credible figure. I would expect our best estimate to be between four and eight million Jews (by Hitler's idea of Judaism) killed, plus others dying in other circumstances.

I would be appalled at the idea Hitler killed one person simply for the "crime" of being born a Jew. Would you agree to condemn Hitler if we could show that his policies led to this one death, a deliberate execution of a person for being of a certain ethnic group, and that he approved of it? If not, why not?

THE ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE

The Anti-Defamation League is not illegal. Since you claimed it was, please tell me under what laws this group is cited as being illegal. If you can't, you should say so. At least, don't try to be silent about it. Tell me what laws it has broken and what political authority has outlawed it.

The ADL did not "terrorize" the Organization of American Historians. No reputable group of scholars would want to be associated with a group like yours, and to point out that you had secretively latched onto their mailing list appalled them. All the ADL had to do was point it out, and the Organization of American Historians dropped you like a ton of hot bricks.

The ADL is not the representatives *[sic]* of a foreign dictatorship. I will not argue about the state of the government of Israel, but only note that the links between the ADL and Israel in no sense make it a representative of Israel. If so, it would be registered. Is it? Why not look for facts, and not make wild and unsupported accusations?

The ADL did not tell American academics what they can or cannot read. Most of them, as experts agreed, would have picked up your rag with a pair of tongs and dropped it into their wastebaskets. The ADL would not try to do this. The academics would not stand for it. It did not happen.

This was not academic terrorism, or terrorism of any kind. When your secret and covert machinations were exposed, decent people turned on you and rejected you. Of course they apologized to the ADL, for the error they had been engaged on, and promised not to do it again. Who wouldn't?

The freedom of dissent was not involved, and it was not impaired. If you, in your rage, want to dissent, go ahead. If you won't recognize the truth, we will be sorry for you. But your power to dissent, and to argue with the ADL, was not reduced one whit by this action.

There is not a single statement about the ADL in your whole letter that is not false, fallacious, and spurious. You are not only not objective, you are wide of the truth. If this is your standard, your efforts will only help to destroy truth. The best thing you could do would be to get out of the business you are in, and go back to school to learn simple logic, history, and an appreciation for the truth.

LUTHER ON THE JEWS

Luther did write a diatribe about the Jews called *The Jews and Their Lies*. It has not been suppressed. It is of little theological interest, and there is little sociological interest in Luther for items that are clearly the result of his evangelical drive, and the resistance of the Jews to becoming Christians. He was disturbed because they would not acknowledge that Jesus was the Christ, and used the same violent language he used against the Roman Catholics and the Baptists against them.

If you want to read this little treatise, you can find scholarly editions of it. But please do not use Luther, or St. Paul for that matter, as authority for a position on the Jews, unless you read also some of the other matter they wrote on theology. While neither Paul nor Luther was an apologist for the Jews, or for the ADL, they would be appalled by your own views. They verge, it seems to me, on anti-semitism, and this, for a Christian, would be a terrible criticism.

HISTORICAL STUDY SHOULD LEAD TO TRUTH

In this letter there is little that is true. Your opinions are biased and false. Your knowledge of definite situations in the past is limited. Your view of foreign political administration is lamentably meager. You are not equipped for what you are doing.

Couldn't you find another trade?

You don't seem equipped for history. If you are the director, what sort of material do you put out? If you edit the magazine, how can anyone expect to find anything of value in it?

Yours in Christ Jesus our Lord

Pastor John Holte Hagen
Box 97
Nerstrand, Mn 55053

The Holocaust, and the Myth of the Past as History

DR. HOWARD F. STEIN

In a recent letter commenting on my paper "Judaism and the Group-Fantasy of Martyrdom: The Psychodynamic Paradox of Survival Through Persecution,"[1] Lewis Brandon posed the question:

> I wonder how far you would go along with our view that it is not just the history of the Holocaust which is sanctified, but that the very "Holocaust" itself is a group-fantasy? (21 July 1980)

This communication attempts to reply to Brandon's thoughtful question. My remarks are based on a decade of psychohistorical/anthropological research into ethnicity, nationalism, American culture, and Judaica.[2]

My point of departure is the simple observation that between 1933 and 1945 some awesomely terrible things took place in Europe -- **to everyone.** It is, however, another matter to view the entire sordid era through the eyes of a single group -- the Jews -- and to accept this interpretation as the only valid one. Yet the very essence of "history" is its ethnocentrism.[3] One ubiquitous function and purpose of having a sense of history, both individual and group, is to replace the reality of the present and past with a defensive myth of the past through which distorting filter we perceive the past. Were it not one's need to falsify retrospectively by distorting, we would now have no need for a "revision" of sacred historical orthodoxies. Only by stepping outside the cozening ignorance of our tribal caves do we have that perspective which compels us **to revise** our cherished errors. Should we wonder why the "Holocaust" is excluded from open scholarly dabate -- save for those "safe" disputes within the boundary of the permissible -- need only note that the violation of any taboo in a "primitive" society is followed by censure, ostracism,

punishment, or death. "History" is socially sacred knowledge. One is duty-bound to reverence, never question, that knowledge.

But that presses us to other questions. What does each group select to enshroud in ineffable mystery? Why, for Jews, the Holocaust? What, in sanctifying the Holocaust, do Jews **not** want to know about that grim era? Whatever be the "facts" of the Holocaust, it is experienced as a **necessity,** as part of a recurrent historic pattern. Reality must be made to conform to fantasy. Whatever did happen in the Holocaust must be made to conform to the group-fantasy of **what ought to have happened.** For the Jews, the term "Holocaust" does not simply denote a **single** catastrophic era in history, but is a grim metaphor for **the meaning of Jewish history.** The "Holocaust" lies at the heart of the Jewish experience of time itself. One is either anxiously awaiting persecution, experiencing persecution, recovering from it, or living in a period that is a temporary reprieve from it.

"Holocaust" is thus the **timeless** fabric into which the 1933-1945 period is woven. Enslavement in Egypt under Pharaoh Ramses II, the two Exiles in Biblical times, pursuit by the Amalekites in the desert on the journey to the Promised Land, the medieval Crusades, expulsion from Spain during the Christian *reconquista* from the Moors, the uprising of the Ukrainian and Polish peasants in 1648 under Bogdan Chmielnicki, are all inseparable parts of the chain in Jewish history from which perspective the National Socialist period is perceived. Thus the "reality" of the Holocaust is inextricably part of the myth in which it is woven -- and for which myth it serves as further confirmatory evidence for the timeless Jewish theme that the world is in conspiracy to annihilate them, one way or another, at least eventually.

The tormented and phantasmagoric Franz Kafka is perhaps this century's most pure distillation of the Jewish persecutory world. "Every obstacle smashes me," he writes to Max Brod. His is a world ruled by an inaccessible, implacable "High Command"; his is a god-less theology of father-Gods, personified by the Bureaucracy, who are remote, unappeasable, overbearing, capricious, formidable. There is No Exit from history; there is No Respite. Philip Rahv writes hauntingly:

> . . . The clue to *The Trial* is in the reflection that "only our concept of time makes it possible for us to speak of the Day of Judgment by that name; in reality it is a summary court in perpetual session." And in the same sequence of reflection we find the perfectly typical sentence: "The hunting dogs are playing in the courtyard, but the hare will not escape them, no matter how fast it may be flying already through the woods." The identification here is plainly with the hare; and with the hunting dogs, too, insofar as they represent the hare's longing for self-punishment, his inner wish to be cornered, to be hurt, to be torn to pieces so as to atone for the guilt that fills him from top to bottom. In this one short sentence about the hare and the hunting dogs you have the gist of the typical Kafkan narrative, the obsessive theme, the nuclear fable concerning the victim of an unappeasable power to which he returns again and again, varying and complicating its structure with astonishing resourcefulness, and erecting on so slender a foundation such marvelous superstructures as that of the myth of the Old Commander in *In the Penal Colony*, the myth of the Law in *The Trial* and of the celestial bureaucracy in *The Castle*.[4]

Here, "art" is both history and prophetic for what would become history in World War II.

Myth truly generates reality in its own image. "History" is more than a group projective myth of the past, a screen on which we see what we need to see in order **not** to encounter reality. The sense of history not only dictates perception of the past, but is a template for the future which will "repeat" the past. Not unexpectedly, Yasir Arafat is often referred to by Israelis as a contemporary exterminationist-Hitler, the Palestine Liberation Organization and El Fatah as Nazis, Brownshirts, SS, and the like. If past, present, and future merge into gauzy sameness, no authentic change can be expected (even though it might be fervently wished): holocausts, walls, ghettos, trials, judgments, punishment are part of the plight of the spectral Ahashueras who is condemned to wander the earth, to be redeemed from history only by death. Now as in the past, historical partners will be found who will only too willingly complement the suicidal wishes of Jews or Israelis. Projected self-hatred returns as provoked hatred. The unofficial Israeli policy of resettlement of Jews on the West Bank;

the fanatacism of the Gush Emunim (Block of the Faithful) who have zealously "occupied" the West Bank; the Israeli claim to the entire city of Jerusalem; the Israeli claim to the West Bank based on "historical" entitlement (Judea/Samaria Biblically -- one can manipulate history such that one can justify virtually any claim!); and the overseas financial and moral support given to these adventures by American diaspora Jewry; these together are unconscious provocations against the Arabs for the war of annihilation which Israelis not only expect but seek in order that the masochistic fantasy come true. Both in the Jewish religious tradition and in secular Israeli nationalism, any awaited-for redemption and resurrection will be heralded by a preceding era of unfathomable cataclysm and bereavement.[5]

Journalist Martin Woollacott writes of the Israelis that: "Refuge is taken in the future, a future in which new outbreaks of anti-Semitism will blast the diaspora. A young and able official, a supporter of the Begin government, knowledgeable and even liberal, said: 'There will be another disaster in world Jewry. It could come in South Africa. It could come in America itself . . .'[6] In the same essay, another Israeli is quoted as saying that "'America is the Jewish national home . . . Israel is the Jewish national graveyard.' "[7] These fears of inevitable death are not the product of lone voices, but the litany of Jewish tradition which traces biblically to the prophetic threat of imminent Yahwistic punishment for the commission of sins. But what "sins"? As Gonen has observed, these sins are in fact **wishes** for the possession of the land (mother), Zion, which is God's Biblical bride.[8] Psychohistorically, Zionism and Israeli nationalism have achieved in reality what is taboo: usurpation of the power of the father-God, the claim upon the mother-land by the son. What remains is the group-fantasy of retribution in which history replays in this third Zionade (return to Zion) the drama of Jewish guilt and punishment.

It turns out that in group history, just as in individual history, an overblown fear camouflages an underlying wish (a point made by Freud eight decades ago). Wim van Leer, an insightful retired Israeli industrialist, writes: "hatred became an indispensible prop for the maintenance of Jewish cohe-

sion and identity, for whenever the cold eye of ostracism was mellowed by a kindly glint, whenever humanism and liberalism reared their ugly heads, Jewish identity melted away in the warm bath of assimilation."[9] Furthermore, "Provoking this hatred for Israel is one of the few areas where Prime Minister Menachem Begin's Government has been a resounding success. A useful tool has been the Gush Emunim . . . We revel in our ostracism and, instead of advancing arguments to justify our actions, we reply to criticism with ever more provocative and oppressive actions."[10] Van Leer's article repeatedly uses "provocation," "defiance," "fanaticism," "dogmatic determinism," and "intransigence" to characterize Israeli actions that once again make Jews into an isolated, emotionally ghettoized people and which will once again occasion the very (next) Holocaust that is as much expected as it is dreaded. We are thus face to face with the terrible psychohistorical truth that **Jews must survive in order that they be persecuted.**

The scientific discipline of history -- indeed, of all behavioral science -- ought rightfully to occupy itself with the search for the "facts." Correcting facts is one thing. But to understand the intractible need to edit reality and thereby distort the facts is an equally important matter. Historical myth is one type of "fact" which must be decoded as well as courageously doubted. For, as we know only too well, the myth of the Holocaust has for forty years been more compelling -- not only for Jews -- than reality. It is this resistance to testing and accepting reality that we must also explain.

Thus, while we constantly struggle to separate myth from fact, we need **also** to accept the fact that people adhere tenaciously to their mythic world-views in order that they not be compelled to come painfully face to face with the world as it is and the repressed world of their childhood. Collectively as well as individually, we remember in order to forget. In the process, our defenses remove us even further from reality so that the world to which we adapt is hopelessly tangled by our projections and displacements. Jews cling to their history of persecution so that they need not look at their own rôle in the process (both the act of persecution and the perception of the act). Greatly simplifying what I have written at length else-

where,[11] this is to say that so central is the Holocaust in that condensation of Jewish history/folklore/myth/world-view, and the like, that it is unimaginable to be a Jew (or even an idealogically anti-"Jewish" Israeli) without it. I would go so far as to say that one who comprehends the Jewish meaning of "Holocaust" (and I encompass some five thousand years here) has understood the Jewish experience of **life:** fear of punishment, expectation of punishment, inevitability of punishment, and, finally, unconscious conviction that punishment is deserved (from Yahweh through Hitler through Arafat). Of course, all this is massively defended against -- not unsurprisingly, by projecting and displacing the wish and fear onto outer sources of rejection and extermination, and **by distorting the reality of history so that it conforms with the myth of history.** It is utterly catastrophic for reality-testing when a group-myth, fuelled by narcissistic trauma of childhood, family, and unresolved past, finds mirroring "confirmation" in current events.

It is precisely at this point that the Holocaust as sacred symbol collides with a scientific approach to the Holocaust as a fact to be analyzed. The magic of "numbers" has long played an almost hypnotic rôle in any discussion of the 1933-1945 period. To most Jews, and to many non-Jews, the Holocaust is defined exclusively in terms of the "six million" Jews who perished. Little mention is made of non-Jewish Slavic peoples, or non-Axis peoples of western Europe who perished. To Jews, the Holocaust, it must be remembered, interweaves two elements of the doctrine of Chosenness: (a) election as moral superiority, and (b) election to suffer. What ethno-centric persecution mania accomplishes is to omit the suffering of non-Jewish victims. It is to say in essence: "Our suffering has more meaning than yours."

At present, one can notice the same process at work in the Mideast negotiations on the "Palestinian" problem or on the political status of Jerusalem. Those two to three million Palestinian refugees and their children living in Arab lands are, from the point of view of pure fact, exiles in no sense different than were the Jews in Europe and Islamic lands who emigrated to Palestine/Israel. Yet, in religious Zionist and secular Israeli nationalist ideology, Arab exiles are an Arab prob-

lem, not an Israeli one; secondly, because Palestine/Israel was envisioned from the outset as a Jewish state and homeland (*Der Judenstaat*, published 1896, the title of Theodor Herzl's manifesto), Arabs would either have to accommodate to the new ethno-nationalist hegemony or leave; and finally, although Jersualem is a holy city to Jewish, Christian, and Islamic faiths alike, Israelis rationalize their greater entitlement to the whole of it because of ancient historic precedent.

Narcissistic self-preoccupation knows no empathy for others outside the self or group-self. This has been the fate both of primitive ethno-centrism and rabid nationalism. "We" (Jews) are good; "they" (Gentiles) are evil. What is more because "we" are Chosen (if not by God, then at least by the duty-bound guilt of the world's nations), the fate of our people is of greater consequence than that of those who oppose us. With the same taunting arrogance of those whom they fled in Europe, Israelis assert, in essence, that "The future belongs to us." What matters, in ethno-nationalist terms, is not the enormity of the "numbers," **but whose they are:** who counts and who is discountable. The expansive claim by Jews and Israelis on land in the Mideast as "atonement" exacted from the world for historic injustices visited upon them is one powerful expression of the narcissistic principle of entitlement. Vengeful demand for restitution underlies the seemingly idealistic contemporary principles of "human rights" based on ethnic, national, or religious grounds.

Let me take this a step further. If Jews feel that their suffering is more significant and historically memorable than that which was afflicted on non-Jewish victims of the Nazis, what then, are we to make of the suffering of the **Germans** during the same period? How are we to understand their rôle in modern European history? Do we not need also to "revise" the great mythology of the West (one held by Russia as well) which holds that psychogeographically, Germany is the perpetual "bad boy" and menacing nemesis of the West, a people who must be kept under vigilant watch (although their economy supported!), and who must remain divided (symbolized by that simple yet sinister wall in Berlin) lest their inherent evil be once again unleashed?

Part of the West's myth of Germany is its denial of flagrant atrocities committed **against** Germany in the name of democracy. The infamous bombing of Dresden is the most conspicuous example in Europe. (The use of the atomic bomb on Japan is the parallel on the Asian front.) In warfare there is invariably a double-standard: what "we" do against the enemy is justified, what "they" do against us is "criminal," "barbaric," and the like. Not the deed itself, but **who** perpetrated it, is our fatuous relativistic argument! Psychologically, the process is disarmingly simple: we fight in our enemies what we hate in ourselves and conveniently locate in them. We fight a disowned part of ourselves in them; in killling them, as symbolic embodiments of our evil, we cleanse ourselves of that evil -- at least temporarily, until the next need for purging through war arises.

The core of Revisionism must be the **re-humanization** of all participants, whatever their rôle, in the Second World War. The consequence, I propose, will be a discovery of a systemic irrationality in which Germany cannot be singled out for blame. "Holocaust" will acquire a far more encompassing meaning in which the drama of the "family" of nations transcends any easy distinction between villains and victims. Let me cite a brief poignant example offered by Professor George Kren:

> I vividly recall a trip in a bus from a psychohistory conference to the airport where I had suggested that I had considered learning to fly a light plane so that I could fly to the various conferences without the hassle of airports and reservations. One of the members of our party, a psychiatrist, indicated that he had been a pilot in the Second World War and described to us in detail his participation in the bombing of Dresden. He was clearly nostalgic. He analyzed the technical problems of getting that many planes into the air so that they would not collide, and then enthusiastically described how the American methods of coming over the target were so much more destructive than the British ones. There appeared an almost erotic infatuation with the technical destructive apparatus. Yet by contemporary psychiatric and for that matter social standards that person was and is totally normal.[12]

A psychohistoric revisionism leads to a radically new interpretation not only of inter-national conduct during the War, but of the very causes of the War itself. Psychohistorian Henry Ebel observes that "Nazism was not only a German but a **world** event -- and that to see the Nazi movement entirely within the German context is to distort its meaning."[13] The regnant myth in the West is that xenophobic, paranoid, self-aggrandizing, anti-Semitic German nationalism was an exclusively indigenous event whose rabid, cancerous spread had to be stopped by nations "allied" to preserve freedom -- nations free of the blemishes which tainted Germany.

Here, quite plainly, projection **onto** Germany plays a dominant role in the creation of the myth of German uncontrollability, invincibility, and the like. We fight the enemies we first make, enemies we need in order that we be "complete" -- at a distance. As psychoanalyst and anthropologist George Devereux writes: "A common defense against the thought that one is psychologically disturbed consists of an attempt to represent the disturbance as peripheral to the self."[14] That is: **my** problem is **you!**

Until now, most students of World War II have focused on German projection **onto** Jews. Conspicuously absent have been studies of **stereotypes about Germany** which made Germans appear as monsters beyond the pale of humanity. What we are discerning, however, is a far more complex **complementary** system of projection in the international family, one in which the Jews were a single sub-system. What could not be tolerated in the "democratic" nations of the West was located exclusively in a supposedly venomous German "national character" that had its roots fifteen centuries earlier in the barbaric invasion by the Goths. If nations wanted Germany to act out aggressively, how then could they be expected to stop Germany **before** Germany was allowed first to wage war? In a process identical to that of a family with a "deviant" or "sick" member, likewise within the international "family" of nations, "specific members take on specific rôles that serve distinct rôles for all the others members of the family."[15] Indeed, one member of the "family" cannot change without threatening the stability of the entire family.

The emotional rôle of "aggressor" which the West "as-

signed" to Germany was first observed by British historian A.J.P. Taylor in *The Origins of the Second World War*[16] -- a work for which he incurred the *odium theologicum* of the scholarly community, not to mention the accusation of being a Fascist sympathizer. What this early "Revisionist" Taylor noted was simply that from the mid-1930s the statesmen of the West were giving Hitler cues to indulge his madness, giving him latitude to flex his muscles, turning away their heads as he continuously tested his limits and found no obstacle in his path.

Today we would say that the complementary pathology of those "normal"-appearing nations of the West was the very thing which permitted Hitler to dare even further. What is true for pathological family systems[17] is equally true for pathological inter-national (group) systems. The officially "normal" are able to mask their sickness and shore up their stability **only** as their designated deviants do their mischief for them.

Very briefly, for instance, consider the role of France in the late 1930s. According to the myth in the West, vulnerable France was victim to the unstoppable *Blitzkrieg* which Hitler unleashed mercilessly in 1939. Yet, in some recent psychohistoric work, Jacques Szaluta and Stephen Ryan[18] turn this interpretation of the fall of France upside down (likewise, David Beisel[19] reinterprets the Munich "mistake" as based on the West's passivity and denial of reality, beneath which lay an encouragement for Germany to press even further).

Szaluta and Ryan link the fall of Republican France to a French fear of and **wish for** abandonment, expressed in fantasies of defeat, suicide, homosexual surrender, punishment, and the need to pay for pleasure with pain. How could a France which felt **feminized** possibly feel strong enough to **repel** Germany's **penetration?** Likewise, how could Marshall Pétain, leader of the Vichy government, **resist** the Germans when his own heightened conflicts over abandonment led him, like his countrymen who followed him, to abandon France to Germany? Psychologically, what the French felt they deserved they allowed to happen -- with their passive complicity. **Fantasy, in other words, so powerfully affected the perception of reality that it helped bring about the very**

reality which was as much sought as it was consciously repudiated.

It was the West's fantasy about Hitler's and Germany's **virility** (masculinity) that gave the Nazis the time and space and practice to perfect **their** fantasy in reality. Were it not for this deadly combination of admiration, envy, passivity, and delegation of the "aggressor" rôle, the West would not have given such license to German impudence. Not only did Hitler believe his propaganda, but his later-adversaries were paralyzed by it because they also wanted to believe it.

In fact, rather than fantasy, Hitler was ill-prepared for war in September 1939. Yet it was the shared, complementary, fantasy, rather than military fact that prevailed -- and which allowed the Germans to translate their group-fantasy (reversal of the trauma of 1918; the resurrection of the "betrayed" Siegfried into superhuman heroism) into fact. Ebel notes that

> Sixty percent of the German artillery, in 1939, was still being pulled by horses, and to accomplish the *Blitzkrieg* invasion of France he had to skim the armored units from a great number of divisions and fling them into the center of France. Had the French refused to panic at the sight of those flags moving across the map, and vigorously counterattacked, they might well have won. Instead, they could not bring themselves to believe that any world leader might be willing to bet on the potency of his theatrical fantasies -- and they allowed themselves to be **intimidated** into surrendering. Afterward, there were French commentators who declared that defeat was inevitable in view of the greater "virility" of the German uniforms and the German military *panâche.*[20]

The "Triumph of the Will" was joint venture between the victor **and** the vanquished. Ebel writes further:

> The fact that the Western powers, before the Second World War, seemed to be sending out encouraging signals to Hitler -- including encouragements for his anti-Semitic policies -- is perfectly understandable, however, once we acknowledge the extent to which Hitler and Nazism were "acting out" their own suppressed impulses; indeed, the extent to which they were able to suppress those impulses only **because** he was acting them out.[21]

Finally,

> In its anger, its militarism, its aggressiveness, and its rituals of triumph and national purpose, Germany was serving as a delegate of all the other nations, acting out the materials that their own citizens were not prepared to acknowledge -- directly and openly -- as being "their own." The enemy, as always, was also oneself . . .[22]

Viewed in this persepctive, the Germans were every bit as much victims -- both of their own national psychology, mythology, and of their rôle in the international family -- as were the Jews. It was the fatal symbiosis of nations that resulted in a Holocaust in the wake of whose unprecedented **fratricide** (not reducible to "genocide") only Death was victor. So long as we persist in viewing and debating the "Holocaust" as though it were primarily a Jewish or Jewish/German event, we will miss its tragic enormity for all who participated in it.

It is thus proper that a paper which began with a discussion of the Jewish myth of the Holocaust, concludes with the preliminary formulation of a revision of the entire Western myth of the 1933-1945 period. Consideration of Lewis Brandon's initial question led me to broaden and thus restate it. No single group can claim that period as its private property. In the earlier part of this paper, I briefly explored the **meaning** of the Jewish claim on the Holocaust. In the final section of the paper, I have argued that to over-focus on the fate of the Jews is to join rather than analyze the truly inter-national group-fantasy of World War II: it is to postpone insight into what was a Holocaust for all humanity.

REFERENCES

1. Howard F. Stein, "Judaism and the Group-Fantasy of Martyrdom: The Psychodynamic Paradox of Survival Through Persecution," *The Journal of Psychohistory* 6(2)(Fall 1978) pp151-210.

2. Howard F. Stein, "The Binding of the Son: Psychoanalytic Reflections on the Symbiosis of Anti-Semitism and Anti-Gentilism," *The Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 46(1977) pp650-683; "American Judaism, Israel, and the New Ethnicity," *Cross Currents* 25(1)(Spring 1975) pp51-66; "The Nazi Holocaust, History and Psychohistory," *The Journal of Psychohistory* 7(2)(Fall 1979) pp215-227; "The White Ethnic Movement, Pan-Ism, and the Restoration of Early Symbiosis: The Psychohistory of a Group-Fantasy," *The Journal of Psychohistory* 6(3)(Winter 1979) pp319-359; Stein, Howard F. and Robert F. Hill, *The Ethnic Imperative: Exploring the New White Ethnic Movement*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1977.

3. Howard F. Stein, "Psychohistory and the Problem of Historical Understanding: Reflections on the Metapsychology of History," invited paper presented at the annual meetings of the Western Social Science Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 24 April 1980.

4. Philip Rahv, "Introduction," *Selected Short Stories of Franz Kafka*, Random House, 1952. ppx-xi.

5. Jay Y. Gonen, *A Psychohistory of Zionism*, Mason Charter, NY, 1975; "The Israeli Illusion of Omnipotence Following the Six Day War," *The Journal of Psychohistory* 6(2)(Fall 1978) pp241-271; "Resurrection and Bereavement: The Duality in Jewish History," paper presented at the third annual convention of the International Psychohistorical Convention, New York City, 12 June 1980.

6. Martin Woollacott, "Waiting in Vain for Soviet Jewry," *The Guardian*, 10 June 1979.

7. *Ibid.*

8. Gonen 1980, *op. cit.*

9. Wim van Leer, "In Israel, 'We Revel in Our Ostracism,' " *The New York Times*, 3 March 1980.

10. *Ibid.*

11. See Stein 1975, 1977, 1978, *opera cit.*

12. George Kren, "The Psychohistorical Interpretation of Nazism and the Social Construction of Evil," paper presented at the annual meetings of the Western Social Science Association, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 24 April 1980.

13. Henry Ebel, "How Nations 'Use' Each Other Psychologically," Manuscript, February 1980, quoted with permission.

14. George Devereaux, "The Works of George Devereaux," in *The Making of Psychological Anthropology*. George D. Spindler, Ed., University of California Press, 1978, p379.

15. Ebel 1980, *op. cit.*

16. A.J.P. Taylor, *The Origins of the Second World War*, Fawcett, 1978.

17. Fred M. Sander, *Individual and Family Therapy: Toward an Integration*. Jason Aronson, NY, 1980

18. Jacques Szaluta, "The Fall of Republican France: A Psychohistorical Examination," paper presented at panel on France and Britain in the Development of the Second World War, third annual convention of the International Psychohistorical Association, New York City, 12 June 1980; Ryan, Stephen, "Petain and Vichy," paper presented at panel noted in #18.

19. David R. Beisel, "Chamberlain and the Munich Crisis," paper presented at panel noted in #18.

20. Ebel 1980, *op. cit.*

21. *Ibid.*

22. *Ibid.*

The Faurisson Affair

DR. ARTHUR R. BUTZ

VERITE HISTORIQUE OU VERITE POLITIQUE? by Serge Thion. 347pp, La Vieille Taupe, Paris, 1980. Distributed by Labyrinthe, 22 rue Rambuteau, 75003 Paris.

In October 1978 *l'Express*, a French weekly comparable to *Newsweek*, published an interview with Louis Darquier de Pellepoix, who had been commissioner for Jewish affairs in the Vichy Government during the German occupation, and who has lived in Spain since the war. Darquier's generally unrepentant attitude, plus his claim that the only creatures gassed at Auschwitz had been lice, set off an uproar with two foci, first, the allegedly outrageous, irresponsible and perhaps even illegal character of the act of publishing such an interview and, second, the regrettable fact that Darquier's Spanish exile made it impossible to "get" him.

Under such circumstances it was inevitable that the fury of the professionally enlightened would turn on Dr. Robert Faurisson for it was known, although almost forgotten, that he held similar views on the "gas chambers" and he was, moreover, situated on French soil and possibly "gettable." Thus against a background of shrieking publicists, a mob of thugs, mostly Jews posing as students, descended on the University of Lyon-2, where Faurisson is Associate Professor of French Literature (with a specialty in criticism of texts and documents), and on account of its disorders the University suspended Faurisson from his teaching duties.

The campaign against Faurisson was not however without its positive aspects for as a result of all the public attention paid to his allegedly wicked views, *Le Monde*, the French equivalent of the *NY Times*, felt itself obliged --much against its wishes -- to give Faurisson a bit of space in which to express his views. Although it gave the other side much more space, an important barrier had been broken and it appears to this reviewer that the France-based defenders of the received "extermination" legend have not bothered to try to conceal

their panic. This is shown not only by the explicit expressions of panic in, e.g., the periodical *Le Monde Juif*, but also in the fact that they, acting through their "LICA" (League Against Racism and Anti-Semitism), brought suit against Faurisson for "damages" on account of "falsification of history," a litigation that is still active at this writing.

Faurisson's relations with his University have also not yet been satisfactorily resolved. Although he still formally holds his position there, since Fall 1979 he has in fact been assigned to a correspondence school in Paris for duties clearly beneath his qualifications.

Serge Thion's book consists principally of a thorough exposition of this affair, but we are also treated to some discussion of earlier public controversies that surrounded Faurisson, of which the earliest did not concern Jews or World War II at all. It was in 1961 that he published his booklet *A-t-on* **lu** *Rimbaud? (Has anybody* **read** *Rimbaud?)* The booklet demonstrated erotic interpretations, where none had been seen before, of the French poet's "Voyelles." The ensuing controversy was carried out in the major French literary periodicals. A measure of the reception given to Faurisson's thesis can be gained from the fact that as a consequence the major French publisher Hachette deleted "Voyelles" from its school textbook line. The booklet was reissued in 1962 and 1971, with the addition of a summary of reactions to the original booklet. In 1972 Faurisson published a long book presenting novel interpretations of Lautréamont, entitled *A-t-on* **lu** *Lautréamont?* Nothing in all of this prefigured his later public involvement with the "Holocaust," but in retrospect a certain common ground is clear, for the Holocaust literature merely has to be read, rather than gazed at in a semi-stupor, in order to be exposed for what it is. Faurisson could have, but unfortunately has not, entitled part of the book under review as *A-t-on* **lu** *"le Journal d'Anne Frank"?*

Although Faurisson had maintained an interest in the "Holocaust" subject ever since reading Rassinier around 1960, his public role as a Revisionist commenced only in 1974. In April he sent letters to several dozen known "his-

torians and specialists," in each case asking "do the Hitlerian gas chambers seem to you to have been a myth or a reality?" and briefly giving reasons for legitimate doubts regarding their reality. It was not known to Faurisson at the time that one of the addressees, Dr. Kubovy, Director of the Jewish Documentation Center in Tel-Aviv, was deceased. However the letter to Kubovy reached an Israeli newspaper, which commented on it, was then picked up by a Jewish weekly in France, and agitated some faculty members at the Censier branch of the Sorbonne (where Faurisson was then teaching) to the extent that they took it up with the University President, who then took the matter to the University Senate, which declared as a consequence that

> The President has been confronted, by colleagues, with the appearance in the weekly *Tribune juive* of an article signed by Mr. Faurisson, which contains inadmissible doubts concerning the existence of the Nazi concentration camps. Now this article was written on the letterhead of our University (Censier branch). As a consequence the President requests that the Senate invite him to address, in its name, a total disavowal of the allegations of our colleague to the newspaper in question. The Senate approves this undertaking unanimously.

This reaction of a supposedly responsible University Senate was a harbinger of the controversies to come. A letter by Faurisson, not intended for publication, and reported second hand, became "an article signed by Mr. Faurisson." Mere questions concerning the existence of the gas chambers became a denial ("doubts," then "allegations") of the existence of the camps. People who had never investigated the subject declared Faurisson's doubts "inadmissible." Faurisson was not invited to present any defense in the course of the Senate's deliberations. The stupidity (to employ the most charitable description) involved was even exceeded two years later by the President of the University of Lyon-2 who, to Faurisson's request for an explanation why promotion was being denied to him, replied that Faurisson, "by his own admission," had never published anything in his life! Since Faurisson's writings on Rimbaud had rocked the French literary establishment, any person with a healthy desire to

savor the intellectually outlandish would be most eager to learn the nature of the evidence that led the President to such a bizarre declaration. It was this. Reacting to claims that he was a "Nazi," Faurisson had on 12 December 1975 addressed a letter to the President pointing out *inter alia* that he had never published anything that could support such a classification. By lifting this remark out of context, the "evidence" of Faurisson's barren intellectual output was produced!

The second furor over Faurisson as Revisionist came in the Fall of 1978 in the circumstances already mentioned. It attained a critical point with the appearance in *Le Monde* (29 December 1978) of a short article by him. The significance of this development may be appreciated if it is noted that, although *Le Monde* had on 17-18 July 1977 published a long attack on the Harwood booklet, and although all canons of journalistic ethics decreed that *Le Monde* must therefore open its columns to controversy on the subject, Faurisson's repeated efforts to get into print there were frustrated. I also wrote a letter to *Le Monde* when I was in Paris in late July 1977; it was not published.

To appreciate some developments of early 1979 it is necessary to go back in time somewhat to a seemingly irrelevant episode. In May 1968 Paris was the scene of uproarious "student" demonstrations that achieved worldwide publicity. The specific issues involved are of no interest here. Suffice it to say that the demonstrators' cause, in the context of the time, was of a "leftist" nature and that the issues were substantial enough to arouse much controversy and division into various camps. As intellectuals, especially the leftist type, are often wont to hang around bookshops where people of compatible inclinations are apt to be found, there existed a group associated with the bookshop La Vieille Taupe (The Old Mole); it is referred to here as the "Guillaume group," after Pierre Guillaume, the proprietor of the bookshop. The group first became prominent for its support of the demonstrators, and includes Serge Thion, author of the volume under review, and Jean-Gabriel Cohn-Bendit, brother of "Danny-the-Red," the leader of the demonstrations.

The Guillaume group maintained both its cohesion and its

prominence in the years after 1968. The members published frequent articles in the daily newspaper *Libération*, and La Vieille Taupe has evolved into a publishing house.

Unknown to Faurisson, Pierre Guillaume had also, on account of reading Rassinier, maintained an interest in the "Holocaust" legend. Hence when the controversy arose in late 1978, with Faurisson an obvious victim of hysteria, the Guillaume group had good reasons to support him. However the ground was quite strange for the members of the group, and more often associated with the Right than with the Left. On the other hand they knew Faurisson by reputation as a man of benevolent character and keen intellect, whose views could not be trifled with.

The key development in shattering any remaining reticence of the Guillaume group seems to have been a two page piece of foolishness that appeared in *Le Monde* on 21 February 1979, an article affirming the extermination legend, signed by 34 historians.

Now, there are certainly circumstances where it is appropriate that a great number of people sign some public statement. An example is the short statement (reproduced in Thion's book), in support of Faurisson's right to research the legend and condemning the campaign against him, that was signed by a great diversity of people, including the anti-Zionist author Alfred Lilienthal, the MIT linguist Noam Chomsky, the Melbourne civil liberties lawyer John Bennett, and myself. In such an instance significance is to be found not primarily in the text involved, but in the number and stature of the people who subscribe to it. However a lengthy purported historical argumentation, whose text is represented as conveying enlightenment on some subject, is something else; it should not require the signatures of any but those who wrote it. One wonders why 34 signers were provided for the *Le Monde* article. I can offer only one hypothesis for the logic involved, best expressed by simile: if it is found that one broadsword is not adequate to eliminate the annoying fly that has gotten into the room, then perhaps 34 broadswords will do the job.

If the 34 signers had caused the discerning reader to anticipate stupidity in the text, the expectation was confirmed.

With all the enlightening effect of Pope Pius IX announcing the Syllabus of Errors, the 34 historians announced that

> It is not necessary to wonder how, **technically**, such mass murder was possible. It was technically possible because it took place. That is the compulsory point of departure for all historical inquiry on this subject. It is fitting for us to simply repeat this truth; there is not and cannot be any debate on the existence of the gas chambers.

Such blazing stupidity (denounced as "absurd logic" by Cohn-Bendit) was probably, for the Guillaume group, a final conviction of the import of Faurisson's position. Guillaume appeared with Faurisson on Italian language Swiss TV, and La Vieille Taupe issued new editions of Rassinier's *Le Mensonge d'Ulysse* and *Ulysse Trahi par les Siens;* both had last been issued in 1961 by a different publisher.

There followed the volume under review, of which half consists of Thion's summary of the controversies that have surrounded Faurisson, with an emphasis on the major one that started in late 1978. The second half consists of contributions by Faurisson, of which the most interesting is his study of the *Diary of Anne Frank.*

A few words outlining the received Anne Frank legend are in order. She was born to a family of German Jews on 12 June 1929. In 1933 the family moved to the Netherlands and Otto Frank, Anne's father, took a business position in Amsterdam. The Germans occupied the Netherlands in 1940. Early in 1941 Otto Frank allegedly started to move the family belongings, piece by piece, to a location not disclosed to the rest of the family, although they were informed that the process was for the purpose of enabling them to "disappear" at the right time. The disappearance supposedly took place on 9 July 1942.

The hiding place is said to have been the Amsterdam building (263 Prinsengracht) in which Otto Frank's business was quartered. On the first or ground floor there was a combination store-warehouse. On what we would call the second floor there were offices, used by business associates of Frank

who were privy to his project. The hiding place consisted of the rear portions of the third and fourth floors; access to the hiding place was through a door, disguised as a cupboard, on the third floor. Here the Franks allegedly lived for over two years, with supplies being brought by trusted friends. Anne had supposedly started keeping a diary about a month before the move to the hiding place, and continued to keep it after the move. On 4 August 1944, the hiding place having been discovered, the Franks were deported to concentration camps. The diary is said to have been overlooked by the police who searched the quarters and picked up later by friends. Anne is said to have died in the typhus epidemic that raged at Belsen shortly before the end of the war.

Otto Frank survived and returned to Amsterdam via Odessa and Marseilles. The *Diary* was allegedly returned to him by the friends, and was published in Dutch in 1947. Translations soon followed; an English translation was published in 1952.

It is important to understand what is, and what is not, contested in the Anne Frank legend. That Jews were being deported from the Netherlands, and consequently had a motivation for eluding the Germans, is not contested. Faurisson states his impressions:

> . . . this Anne Frank really existed; she was a small young girl without great character, without strong personality, without scholarly precocity (even the contrary), and nobody suspected her of writing talent; this unfortunate child knew the horrors of war; she was arrested by the Germans . . .; her mother died in the Birkenau infirmary on 6 January 1945; her sister and she were, around October 1944, transferred to the Bergen-Belsen camp; Margot died of typhus; then Anne, in turn, alone in the world, also died of typhus, in March 1945.
>
> . . .the Franks and, perhaps, other Jews effectively lived in the rear of 263 Prinsengracht. But they lived there quite differently than the *Diary* relates. For example, without doubt they lived a discreet life, but not as in a prison. They were able to live there like many other Jews who sought cover either in the city or in the country. They sought to achieve "cover without being covert." Their venture was woefully commonplace.
>
> . . . truth obliges me to declare that the *Diary of Anne Frank* is but a simple literary hoax.

What are contested, therefore, are both the authenticity of the *Diary* and the authenticity of the life alleged for the two years in question. The "extermination" and "gas chamber" legends are not involved in any direct sense; such involvement is at best indirect in that the continued credence in the *Diary* depends on the same political and social factors which support the extermination legend.

It is useful to remark here that the widely circulated claim, that Meyer Levin authored the *Diary*, is false and based on misinterpretation of the fact that Levin was involved in propagating the Anne Frank legend in the English language, particularly in adaptation for the stage, and sued Otto Frank in this connection. However Levin never claimed to have anything to do with the original Dutch publication and it is virtually certain that he did not.

Readers interested in the *Diary* are probably already aware of Ditlieb Felderer's *Anne Frank's Diary: a Hoax* (IHR, 1980), and perhaps have already learned that the West German *Bundeskriminalamt*, having been permitted by Otto Frank a brief examination, under significant handicaps, of the supposed original manuscript, in 1980 in the town hall of a Swiss village, reported back to the relevant West German court *inter alia* that certain supposedly original notations were made with a ball point pen that was not on the market until 1951.

The 1951 date does not rule out publication in Dutch in 1947 for, as Faurisson notes, the texts of the various translations do not agree with each other and with the original anyway. Faurisson's study is roughly divisible into five phases: the internal criticism of the *Diary*, inspection of the Amsterdam building involved, interview with Otto Frank, examination of related literature, and interviews with related people. Of these five the first will probably interest the typically situated reader most, because the points involved can be easily confirmed. The emphasis in Faurisson's internal criticism is on the clear impossibility of maintaining the secrecy of the hiding place under the conditions described. According to the *Diary* many people not privy to the secret, and who cannot be trusted , enter the building continually. These include the charwoman, the men working in the store-warehouse on the ground floor, and visitors to the offices

directly below the living quarters. The people in adjoining and neighboring buildings are likewise not to be trusted. Consequently the clandestines must take codeine tablets to avoid coughing, "have to whisper on ordinary days," and must avoid using the toilet when visitors are downstairs. That such a game could be played successfully for two years is incredible and at certain points the *Diary* gives details that make the whole thing preposterous, since we also learn e.g. that the vacuum cleaner was used in the middle of the day without objections from the other clandestines, and that "the radio. . .goes on early in the morning and is listened to at all hours of the day, until nine, ten, and often eleven o'clock in the evening." we are also told that ownership of the building changed in February 1943, but that the new owner was **permanently** diverted from inspection of the living quarters, by one of Otto Frank's business associates, on the plea that the latter had forgotten the key!

Like an historical Sherlock Holmes asking the unexpected simple questions, Faurisson immerses himself and the reader in all this and lays bare the squalid hoax (*"supercherie"*). The Franks are presented as installing makeshift curtains shortly after arrival, so that the neighbors do not "see something going on." Faurisson asks, "Now, is not the installation of curtains, in windows which did not have any until then, the best way of signalling one's arrival? Is this not particularly the case if these curtains are made up of **different** pieces?" More basically, "If one has an entire year to choose a hiding place, does one choose his **office**? Does one take his family there? And a **colleague**? And this colleague's family? Does one choose thus a place full of **'enemies'** where the police and the Germans would come automatically to look for you if they find you no longer at home?"

The Institute for Historical Review is to be thanked for its soon to be released English translation of Faurisson's "Anne Frank" analysis. I should like to make a couple of recommendations to those who intend to read it. The analysis is presented on the assumption that the reader has read the *Diary;* a good part would be incomprehensible to those who have not.

The *Diary* should be read beforehand and in the course of the reading that which I consider the most obvious point of

incredibility should be noted. Whoever wrote it had, and also intended it for the postwar reader with, a basically political and historical interest in what happened to the Jews. The *Diary* is not a diary, and it is not the work of a fourteen year old girl. Only the fact that strong evidence of this appears on virtually every page makes it difficult to select specific illustrations. In the entry for 9 July 1942, we read a very detailed description of the four story building involved. The description is supplemented by, and makes frequent reference to, a rather professionally drawn floor plan that is identical in various translations; I would consider the inclusion of the floor plan in a diary incredible even if it were the sort of thing a young girl might have drawn. More conclusively, the entries for the days **prior** to the family's supposed move to a hiding place, at a time when a thirteen year old girl could not possibly have had any inkling of experiences worth recording for posterity, are clearly written for the postwar book reader, e.g. the entry for 20 June 1942 presents a short history of the Frank family and a short summary of the anti-Jewish measures that followed the German occupation of the Netherlands.

There are a number of other Faurisson contributions to this volume. There is the corrected and annotated French translation of the Faurisson interview that appeared in the August 1979 issue of the important Italian monthly *Storia Illustrata;* this will soon be issued in English translation by the IHR. There are some highly interesting photos, relating to "gas chambers," that Faurisson acquired in visits to Auschwitz, as well as a short treatment of the gas chamber of the penitentiary in Baltimore, which makes clear that the gassing of only one person, not to mention the legend's hordes of thousands at a time, is a technically intricate process that cannot be effectively and insouciantly handled with improvisations involving commonplace resources intended and designed for other purposes. There are also short looks at miscellaneous other matters.

I shall close on the subject of "how many?" Faurisson (p197) is in accord with me (*Hoax*, pp237,239) in declaring that the number of Jews who perished

> could be of the order of a million but, more likely, several hundred thousands if one does not count combattant Jews in Allied military uniforms. I insist on the fact that on my part this is a matter of an estimate lacking a properly scientific character . . .

However he further states, after some intervening remarks that should have been more extended and more lucid,

> that, if computers are used here, one could without doubt quickly know the real number of deaths. The deportees were recorded in numerous connections. They left numerous traces.

Faurisson gives the impression that he believes that an accurate estimate, of the number of civilian Jews who perished, is practically achievable; this impression is reinforced by material appearing on pp324f.

Since I am not in accord with such a view, I discussed this matter with Faurisson and learned that he had not been sufficiently clear on this point. What he means is that it would be possible to make an estimate for a restricted class, namely, those Jews who were noted, in written German records, as having died. This class excludes many Jewish deaths that should be considered relevant, e.g. deaths from epidemics in ghettos or occasional pogroms, particularly in the East during the period of German retreats.

Many of the demographic questions we would like to answer are not answerable in the forseeable future, even with the aid of computers. There is a saying among computer users: "garbage in, garbage out." What it means for the sorts of demographic problems of interest here is that, without a data base of adequate scope, accuracy and structure, no useful results can be obtained from a computer, regardless of the sophistication of the analytical and statistical methods employed. I have discussed the principal difficulties in obtaining an adequate data base (*Hoax*, pp13-17, 222-240). There is little that could be usefully added here except perhaps an indication of how futile even some sophistication, substantially funded, could be. A study of available records may, for example, show that it would not be prohibitively difficult to

determine how many Goldsteins and Kaplans there have been in the U.S.A. at various times. These are distinctly East European Jewish names. It may also be found possible to determine the frequency of occurrence of such names among pre-war East European Jews. Perhaps some more analysis would seem to indicate a method of determining numbers of East European Jews who immigrated to the U.S. at various periods, but the whole project would be rendered futile, especially for the postwar period of central interest, by two considerations. First, Jews have always been frequent name changers; this frequency was greatly amplified in the post-war period. Second, a great deal of this name changing was not done formally in the U.S. courts, but informally and even illegally prior to the formal involvement with the U.S.A. For example we know that a great many Jews were given quite irregular and illegal South American passports, with the very active encouragement of the U.S. Government and other agencies that were attempting to help Jews during the war. This does not exhaust the irregularities that Jews resorted to in this period. The consequences are unmanageable demographic problems.

Vinnytsia—The Katyn of Ukraine (A Report by An Eyewitness)

M. SELESHKO

Toward the end of February, 1944, when I was marking time in a German prison in Potsdam, I was transferred to cell number 20, already occupied by several other prisoners. After a brief acquaintance I learned that one of these was a Ukranian from the vicinity of Vinnytsia. We came to know each other closely and he told me his life history. At that time he was twenty-three years of age, born and bred in Soviet Ukraine. He had been educated by the Communist party and had been a Communist in the full meaning of the word. Communist ideals were his ideals. He fought on the German-Soviet front. After his capture by the Germans, he was forced into anti-aircraft artillery work for the Germans in Berlin. Because of negligence in line of duty he was thrown into jail. There our paths met.

I kept asking him questions about life under the Soviets. He formerly belonged to a civilian border patrol unit. Being a Comsomol, he took his duties seriously and helped track down many foreign intelligence agents who were trying to slip across the border into the Soviet Union. There were others, young Soviet patriots like himself, in the villages and districts.

He told me of the steps taken by the Soviets in Ukraine as a preparation for war. In the Communist party at least as early as 1937 it was felt that war against Germany was imminent. Confidential instructions to members of the party and the Comsomol stressed this eventuality. These instructions ordered that the Soviet hinterland in Ukraine be purged of enemies of the people. By the words "enemies of the people" were meant not only all those people who worked actively against the Soviet regime, but also those who were believed to be inclined to hostility toward the government including those whose complete devotion to the regime had not been clearly manifested.

A purge of enemies of the population of the Soviet border

regions was commenced. Herein lies the story of the Ukrainian tragedy in Vinnytsia, which was revealed to the world in 1943. (Vinnytsia is a Ukrainian city, which was, prior to 1939, approximately 100 miles from the eastern border of Poland.)

My young companion is now a Ukrainian patriot, and much about him must not be made public. Everything he said supplemented my own knowledge of the Vinnytsia tragedy and helped to complete the picture I had formed of it during my experiences in Vinnytsia.

In the summer of 1943 I was living in Berlin under the close supervision of the Gestapo as a suspected foreigner, an unreliable alien and a Polish citizen. On 2 July 1943, during the noon hour, I was called to the telephone by what the Germans called the Ukrainian Confidence Service. This was a German government agency which registered all Ukrainians in Germany and tried to win their support for German purposes among the Ukrainians.

The chief of this agency informed me that in the near future a special committee for the investigation of mass murders in Ukraine would depart to do its work on the spot. He also told me that I had been appointed interpreter for this committee because of my knowledge of German, Ukrainian, Russian, and Polish, and in addition because I knew how to type in both German and Ukrainian. He suggested that I accept this position voluntarily and at the same time emphasized that, should I refuse, I would be drafted for it on the basis of a certain mobilization regulation.

I had no choice. I asked for several hours to consider the proposal. I immediately got in touch with my friends, among them Dr. Oleh Kandyba-Olzhych, the Ukrainian poet, who was living illegally at that time in Berlin. We agreed that it would be best for me to go with the commission, even though its destination was not known. And I had not asked, for in Germany during the war it did not pay to be overly inquisitive.

After two hours I called the confidence service and announced my willingness to accompany the commission as a translator-interpreter, I was instructed to await further instructions via telephone. About 5 p.m. of the same day the

headquarters of the criminal police telephoned. I was ordered to appear at their address and to report to an official named Denerlein. I went.

Denerlein, a friendly man of rather advanced age, immediately introduced me to several officials in his department, and said that we would depart for Ukraine immediately. After brief interviews I was given appropriate military travelling documents and allowed to return home.

The criminal police department was swarming with uniformed police, some of them wearing an arm-band marked SD, which meant that these officials were from the special political section *Sicherheits-Dienst*. By piecing together various bits of conversation I deduced that our group was going to the front lines. Among the members of the commission were Raeder, Krupke, and Groner, all three commissars of the criminal police. State-councilor Klass, the chairman of the commission, was already at the place where the commission was supposed to function.

We set out 4 July 1943, by way of Warsaw, Lublin, Kovel and Shepetivka. Before our departure I was given a pistol as a preparation for any eventuality. We were unmolested in Warsaw, although at that time the battle in the Jewish ghetto was going on but beyond that city our route was through a region controlled by Ukrainian insurgents (UPA).

Immediately outside of Warsaw we passed long trains that had been blown up. In the town of Kovel in the Ukrainian province of Volyn we had to transfer to another train. Precautionary measures for defense against partisans were taken and, ridiculously enough, I was ordered to hold my pistol in my hand in ready position for firing against the machine-guns and mines of the guerillas. We were not attacked, however, for the insurgents shot up with machine guns the dummy tank train that had been purposely sent ahead of us and we experienced nothing beyond fear. At the railway station in Shepetivka, however, we met action on a somewhat broader scale. After our train, loaded with German soldiers, pulled in at the railway station, the Ukrainians destroyed all of the four rail lines leading into Shepetivka and we could not continue the journey. We managed to reach Vinnytsia without any losses, around 11 o'clock at night. We

were driven in police automobiles to No. 5 Mazepa street. Under the Bolsheviks this had been named Dzherzhinsky street and the building had housed the regional headquarters of the NKVD.

Excavations in Vinnytsia

In Vinnytsia I was informed about the purpose of the commission by one of its members, a photographer, who arrived in the city at some earlier date. With the aid of the civilian population mass graves had been discovered, in which thousands of corpses had been buried. These graves were to be opened and the commission was to establish whom the NKVD had murdered. The commission lived and worked in the former headquarters of the NKVD, the place from which the mass-murder was directed. It included among its members German specialists in criminal investigation.

The exhumations in Vinnytsia began on 25 May 1943, and were carried on in three places. The population was of the opinion that there were around 20,000 victims in the war years. In addition to our commission two other bodies—a legal and medical commission—took part in the investigations.

Our committee unpacked its equipment, set up its office and on 7 July after lunch set out in automobiles for the scene of the exhumations—a garden along the Lityn highway, which leads from Vinnytsia to Lviv by way of Lityn.

From the conversation of the police, who were housed in the same barrack that we were, I had gained a more or less adequate picture of what had taken place. The first sight of the corpses horrified me, as did the stench that came from them. It was a hot summer day and it was necessary to steel one's nerves in order to live through the horrible experience. I had been a soldier in the Ukrainian army during the First World War and had seen many men killed in battle, but what I had then seen can in no way be compared with what I witnessed in that park.

A huge mass of people were milling among the trees in the garden. Everything was permeated with the heat of summer

and the horrible stench of corpses. Here and there workers were digging up the earth. From it with the use of ropes they pulled out human corpses, some of them whole, others in pieces. They laid them carefully out on the grass. At first it seemed to me that there were thousands of them, but later I counted them and there were but 700 lying on the grass. Everybody present had a serious expression. The local inhabitants examined the exhumed corpses, and scrutinized the remnants of clothing. From the graves workers threw out bits of cloth and placed them in separate piles. The wet clothes were spread on the grass to dry. The dry clothes were searched for papers and other belongings. Everything was taken out, and registered; the documents found were read, when possible, and recorded; those not legible were preserved. Now and then from one group or another burst out the agonizing, hysterical cry of a woman, or the groan of a man, which resembled the terror of death. A woman recognized the clothes of her loved ones, or a man those of a member of his family. All of them, it was later ascertained, had been sure that their relatives were somewhere in exile in Siberia, perhaps, or in the Far East, in the North, somewhere. Now they learned how the Soviet government had fooled them, for their loved ones lay in Ukrainian soil, in Vinnytsia, murdered by the NKVD. The government had met all questions with the reply that all in exile were deprived of the right of communicating with their families.

After the first shock had lessened, and I had become accustomed to the sweet, unpleasant stench, I took a greater interest in the investigations. The digging was done by common criminals from the local prison under the guard of German police. Alcohol was frequently given to the workers so that they might be able to stand the stench. Men and women, clothed and unclothed, were dug up. Men with their hands tied behind their backs. Here and there heads that had been beaten in; sometimes the nape showed signs of bullet-wounds. Black corpses, mummified corpses, corpses yellow-black with cadaverous wax. They had been in the earth a long time, for the most part deformed by the pressure of the soil above. Members of the commission, old criminologists who had seen many a crime, affirmed that

never before had they seen anything so ghastly. In an area close to the graves doctors made immediate autopsies and tried to ascertain the cause of death. The horror of Vinnytsia I shall never forget and it is doubtful whether even a Dante would be able to portray the agony that had taken place.

Our next point was the Gorky Park of Culture and Rest, named in honor of the Russian poet. Here the scene was no better than the previous one. A lesser number of corpses was unearthed, for the most of the digging was done in the garden along the highway. The bodies of mothers, fathers, sisters, and brothers had been buried under the earth and over it boards had been placed for the young people to dance and amuse themselves, unaware that their relatives' corpses were lying underneath! The names of those Communists responsible for such diabolical measures are known and it is hoped that their evil memory will not pass into history forgotten.

The picture was the same in the graveyard opposite the park. Beside the regular graves as well as under the stones of the original graves were found mass-victims of the NKVD.

The Commission at Work

The committee worked industriously. Witnesses of the horrible tragedy were questioned, the place of the criminal executions determined, and the time as well. Documents found either alone or on the corpses were analyzed, nothing was overlooked; German thoroughness, often approaching absurdity, as it seemed to me, was employed. I was not acquainted with the techniques of criminologists, the clues they put together in order to arrive at the facts, and often what to me appeared beyond dispute they accepted with reservations and searched for unimpeachable evidence. The hours of work were from 10 to 16 each day. I was used as an interpreter between the local inhabitants and the German specialists. Thousands of people volunteered to act as witnesses for the commission. They volunteered in spite of the fact that Bolshevik agents made many threats of revenge, and insisted that the Germans had killed these people and were now seeking to place the blame on the NKVD. This twist interested me and I paid special attention in order to ascer-

tain its veracity. Insofar as I am concerned there is no doubt that the unearthed corpses in Vinnytsia were the first victims of the Bolsheviks, murdered in what was in fact a preparation for war.

I cannot describe the entire work of the commission, all that it ascertained and concluded. I imagine that its findings have been recorded in detail and are available somewhere. As a Ukrainian in civilian attire it was easy for me to get around, for I felt that I was at home, on native Ukrainian soil. The Germans, of course, did not enjoy such a confidence in Vinnytsia, for they had come as conquerors. A complete history of the entire tragedy will one day be written by historians. I was forbidden from doing anything on my own and was able to maintain official contact with my friends only through the German military post office, which was scrutinized by the Gestapo. I made no personal notes. Instead, another opportunity presented itself: through the kindness of one of the members of the commission I was able to send personal letters to Ukrainian friends in Berlin. He gave the letters to a pilot assigned to regular duty between Berlin and Vinnytsia. I recorded as much as I could in the form of private letters, and the material arrived in the hands of my friends without accident. On the basis of these letters I am able to reveal the impression I had of the tragedy in Vinnytsia.

Some Special Incidents of the Tragedy in Vinnytsia

A few incidents will illustrate the tragedy.

The wife of a priest named Biletsky from the vicinity of Vinnytsia recognized the garments of her husband lying on a mound. She cleaned the garment and a patch was revealed. As proof that she spoke the truth she departed for her village, and returned to the commission a few days later with other bits of the material used for patching. The committee examined the material and agreed that the patch on the priest's coat came from the same material. This was proof that her husband had been shot and buried in Vinnytsia, but the NKVD had informed her that her husband was in exile without the right of communicating with his family.

Hanna Hodovanets, a Ukrainian peasant woman, recognized her husband's coat as they unearthed it from a mass-grave. She told the police about her husband's arrest. He had been arrested because he had not reported at work on a certain holiday. She had done everything possible to find out what had happened to him, and one day in 1938 she received a card from Moscow, from the procurator's office and signed by none other than Audrey Vyshinsky, with the news that her husband had been freed from prison in March, 1938. However, her husband had never returned home and she felt that something was wrong. Her feelings became a sad reality when she recognized her husband's coat.

Another Ukrainian woman, Olkhivska by name, sat for hours on the hills of dirt as the corpses were lifted from the graves. At one grave she gave vent to cries of anguish. She had just recognized her husband, who had been arrested by the NKVD, by a broken small finger as well as by his clothes. And she too told a story that ended in a mass-grave.

There were similar examples by the hundreds, while thousands of others found no clues whereby they might identify their loved ones. I talked with them, recorded their tragedies, shared their suffering. The commission studied the methods of Soviet interrogation and trial, torture and execution, prison and exile. It interviewed thousands of witnesses, went through a mass of varied documents, and examined the belongings of witnesses.

The following incident suggests that justice may yet triumph in this world. A note was found in the coat of the exhumed corpse of a heroic Christian. It was wet, as was the corpse, but was carefully dried. Then I set to work to decipher it. With the aid of several local Ukrainians we put together the story. The paper was of ordinary stock, white in color, used in local school tablets. In crude handwriting was penciled: "I . . . beg the person that finds this note to pass on to my wife, Zina . . . from the village . . . region of . . . that I was denounced to the NKVD by the following . . ." And here were the names and address of seven persons. The note continued: "They bore witness against me before the NKVD and spoke falsehoods. I have been sentenced to death and in a short time will be shot. God knows that I am innocent. Let God forgive their transgression; I have forgiven them."

We refused to believe what we had read. To expect such magnanimity from a simple peasant in the moment of death was too much to believe. But the fact stirred everybody. We informed those in charge of the investigation, and later it was found that it was all true. Two of the persons named in the note had died in the meantime, two were officers in the Red Army, and three were available in the neighborhood, peacefully going about their business, since no one knew that they were secret assistants of the NKVD. During my presence in Vinnytsia they were not arrested. The Germans, however, recorded all the secret helpers of the NKVD. Some of them managed to obtain administrative posts during the occupation, and often announced themselves as of German origin. The Germans were aware of this manoeuver and were preparing a surprise move called "lightning-action," *blitzaktion.* I was later informed that this "lightning action" had been executed before the Germans abandoned Vinnytsia.

Hulevych, Skrepek, and many other Ukrainians testified how the NKVD transported the corpses to the burial points. They stated that the bodies were transported from NKVD headquarters at No. 5 Dzherzhinsky street, that at night they saw and heard the trucks in action and that in the morning on the way to work they saw the blood that had dripped from the trucks and that they saw NKVD underlings covering up the signs of their work at the site of the mass graves. There were also witnesses who testified that from trees they observed what was happening behind the high walls of the NKVD compound and that graves were dug and corpses buried. It was a fact well circulated in the city that two Ukrainians, who had dared to peer through the board fence despite the prohibition, had disappeared never to be seen again. It was also common talk that a boy, who had tried to climb the fence in order to steal some apples, disappeared without a trace after the NKVD guards caught him in the act.

How the NKVD Operates

I talked with those people in Vinnytsia who first divulged the information about the mass murders, on the basis of which excavation was begun by the Germans. The commis-

sion found a woman who had worked in the NKVD headquarters for fifteen years. She was superannuated, and not in command of all her mental faculties, but the memory of what had transpired long before she retained as though it had happened yesterday. When the Bolsheviks retired before the German advance, she remained in Vinnytsia by frustrating efforts made by the government to evacuate her. Her revelations, although chronologically vague, were valuable in that they described Soviet methods of investigation and punishment. Former prisoners of the NKVD gave corroborative testimony.

One such former prisoner, named Dashchin, who had been in exile in the Kolyma region, told of an incident in a gold-mining camp. The camp contained 7,000 prisoners from all parts of the Soviet Union, and upon completion of the work there it was evident that the means of transportation to another locality were not available. The prisoners were too weak from malnutrition to go elsewhere on foot, for the nearest work-camp was thousands of kilometers distant. The problem was solved very simply. The prisoners were driven to a cliff that had been mined, and were blown into oblivion. Dashchin was one of the few that miraculously survived the explosion. Somehow he managed to trek across Siberia and return to Ukraine.

The NKVD usually made arrests at night, searching the house and later writing a protocol on the case. The Commission found very many of these protocols both with the corpses and in a separate grave where only documents were buried. All arrested were accused of being "enemies of the people." Some had refused to renounce their religion, others had opposed the collectivation of their private property, still others had spoken dangerous words against Communism. Some had been victims of denunciations or revenge, others had failed to appear at work during a religious holiday, while many had changed their place of work without the permission of the NKVD. Many witnesses questioned by the committee were unable to explain why their relatives had been arrested. Their inquiries addressed to the NKVD or the judge simply evoked the stereotyped reply, "enemies of the people exiled for a long period of time without the right of com-

munication with their relatives." Women appealed to Stalin and other leaders of the Soviet state, but the reaction was the same. I saw and read many cards carrying that message. Among the items found in the graves were remnants of priestly garments, religious books, and correspondence of the murdered with the authorities of the state and the police. Items discovered were put on display—photographs, letters, postage stamps, and crosses—and many residents identified their dead relatives by them.

A religious group in the region of Ulaniv deserves special mention. Called the sect of St. Michael, nineteen of its members were arrested by the NKVD and some of them were identified in the graves. They were recognized because it was their custom to wear a white cross sewn to their clothes. Garments with this cross were found in the graves, sometimes alone and at times still about the corpse. Many members of this sect visited the excavations and recognized their co-religionists.

Statistics of the Tragedy

From May 1943 to October 1943, 9,432 corpses were found in three places of excavation. There were 91 graves with corpses, and three with only clothes or documents. Forty-nine graves had from one to 100 corpses, 33 from 100 to 200 corpses, and nine from 200 to 284 corpses. One hundred and sixty-nine corpses were of women, 120 of advanced age, according to the findings of the medical commission. Forty-nine women were of young or middle age. The corpses of females of advanced age were clothed, whereas those of the younger years were naked. This seemed to bear out the rumors common among the local population that the young women arrested by the NKVD were subjected to sexual brutalities prior to their execution. One pregnant woman was found who had actually given birth to a child in the grave. Most of the corpses were of people from 30 to 40 years of age. Most had died from bullets from a special gun. Some of the victims had been hit by two bullets, others had but one bullet in the head, while still others had received as many as four. Evidences of skull fracture by means of an

instrument, apparently the butt of a rifle, was found in 391 cases. The stronger men had their arms and legs bound. Cases of shooting in the forehead as well as the back of the head were recorded.

Of the total of 9,432 corpses 679 were identified, 468 by their garments, 202 by documents, and 2 by body marks. From the point of view of occupation the identified included 279 peasants, 119 workers, 92 officials, and 189 members of the intelligentsia. Nationally the identified were broken down into 490 Ukrainians, 28 Poles, and 161 uncertain, although the names of the last group suggested almost all the nationalities of the USSR and some from Europe as well.

These basic statistics speak for themselves. Only one place, the garden, was thoroughly examined, for the park and the cemetery were only partially investigated. It is not excluded that many more bodies had been buried in these places. Other localities, which according to the reports of the local population, were also scenes of mass murder by the NKVD were not inspected. It was ascertained that other Ukrainian cities that had been regional and district headquarters of the NKVD had also experienced mass executions. Efforts were made to verify the rumors circulating among the population regarding mass graves. Kiev, Odessa, Zhytomir, Berdychiv, Haisyn, Dnipropertrovsk, Krasnodar in the Kuban region, and other places were supposed to be investigated, but chaotic conditions in Ukraine frustrated such endeavors. It is known, however, very definitely that in Krasnodar, where the Kuban cossacks fought stubbornly against the Bolsheviks in an effort to win independence, the NKVD employed a special machine which ground up the bodies of those shot and oftentimes still living persons as if they were meat and automatically dumped this mass of flesh into the Kuban river. This brutality was affirmed by eyewitnesses who reported various phases of the slaughter.

My companion in the German prison in Potsdam told me that in 1937 instructions were given both to the Communist party and the Comsomol to cleanse the border districts of Ukraine of "enemies of the people." This purge was carried out. The revelations of this former Comsomol both agreed

with and supplemented the findings obtained by the committee of investigation.

Bibliography

Black Deeds of the Kremlin, Vol. 1, Toronto, 1953.

Crime of Moscow in Vynnytsia, Scottish League for European Freedom, Edinburgh, 1952, 32pp, reprinted by IHR, 1980, $3.

Massenmord in Winniza (Mass Murder in Vynnytsia), German Government, 1940?

The Gulag Archipelago, Vol 3, Alexander Solzhenitsyn.

History of Ukraine, "America," Philadelphia, 1975.

Palestine: Liberty and Justice

SAMUEL EDWARD KONKIN III

For thirty years the conflict raging in the Middle East between Arabs and Israelis has been viewed on tribal partisan grounds. You were either pro-Israel or anti-Israel, and in the latter case, anti-Israel was assumed to be a thin camouflage for "anti-Semitic." With the onset of the 1970s and thanks to the "New" Left, one could be "pro-Arab" rather than just anti-Israel, but the tribalism was expanded, not reduced. Now it was the Arab/Marxist/anti-imperialist tribe against the Israeli/capitalist/Western Democracy camp. Then came the Energy "Crisis" and the division was further muddled by petro-plutocrats lining up with Arabs who were clearly not Marxist and not terribly anti-imperialist.

In other issues of international importance, from World War II to Viet Nam, there was a sense of morality: to which side in a foreign conflict belonged justice? For which side did you cheer in expectation of increased liberty? Not so in Palestine; it was and largely still is assumed we are talking about raw survival: if Israel loses, the Jews will be exterminated (again?); if Israel wins, it might be generous and dole a little *noblesse oblige* to the losing Arabs. Heads they win, tails they win.

There has been a third view of "plague on both your houses," but few of any ideology or intellect or religious commitment have attempted to assess the Palestinian Question (however posed) in terms of maximizing justice. The defenders of Israel will cry "aggressor" at surrounding Arab states rattling their sabres at the Israeli state, but revert to amoral technical discussion when Israeli border expansion or internal treatment of non-Jews comes up.

To find the fourth position of evaluation of historical causation of the present Palestinian situation combined with a determination not to increase the injustice by intervention, one has to look beyond the Left/Right, Zionist/anti-Semitic speeches. As early as the late 1960s, Murray N. Rothbard

called exactly for that in his publication *Libertarian Forum* at the very beginning of the modern libertarian movement.

Revisionism on the World Wars, Korea, and Viet Nam, was integral to libertarianism from its inception; a 1960s' *Rampart Journal* of Robert LeFevre's devoted to Revisionism and spotlighting James J. Martin became a treasured classic to the thousands of students who poured into the movement in 1969 and subsequent years. But since those few libertarians who had not come from the pro-Israel conservative Right had come from the equally pro-Israel Liberal Left (Ayn "Rand," a source of many proto-libertarians, is and was strongly pro-Israel), Rothbard's staunchly Revisionist views on Palestine clapped like a thunderbolt across still-infant libertarian consciousness. For a decade, Rothbard and Martin, and the most radical libertarian Revisionists they inspired -- Roy Childs, Leonard Liggio, Joseph Castrovinci and Ron Hamowy -- battled to win primacy for the Revisionist-isolationist view over the limited-government, Whig-imperialist view of the ex-conservative apologists (most prominently John Hospers and his coterie).

Bit by bit the Revisionists prevailed on World War II, the Cold War, the Progressive era, and perhaps most easily, Southeast Asia. The Middle East issue was the hardest to win -- and by that token the most important victory. Ten years after Rothbard's thunderbolt, the ex-Randist Society for Individual Liberty (SIL) published the first hesitant editorials in their *Individual Liberty* calling for isolationist anti-war activism against U.S. policy in the Middle East based on a tentative Revisionist historical outlook. Finally, Roy Childs, who had ascended to the editorship of *Libertarian Review* after its takeover by Koch's foundation, the crucial bridge and centrist publication between the Libertarian Left and Right, published Bill Birmingham's exhaustive review of Edward W. Said's *The Question of Palestine*. Victory!

The radical Revisionists have prevailed. Consider Birmingham's rhetoric (p40):

> The problem, I think, is that the thinking of anti-Palestinian libertarians suffers from a common defect that manifests itself in their view of foreign affairs. The people who think the

Palestinians "want to drive the Jews into the sea" are generally those who believed -- and perhaps still believe -- that the U.S. was "defending freedom" in Vietnam or Iran. In all these cases, the facts about the oppressed people in question were and are easy to find, but they were ignored or denied -- mainly, in my opinion, because of an unwillingness to believe that these non-Western people could have genuine grievances that libertarians could support. The sometimes reactionary and obtuse letters *LR* has received in response to its articles on Iran and the Middle East seem prime examples of this.

The Question of Palestine is especially valuable to libertarians because it deals not so much with facts about Palestine (though it includes them in abundance) as with attitudes: the kind of attitudes libertarians have to shuck off if they are ever to effectively relate to the people of the Third World. I would like to see American libertarians, for example, demand the U.S. end its support for Israel -- not because it is a drain on the Treasury, or because it could embroil us in war, although those are perfectly good reasons, but because it enables Israel to murder and oppress the Palestinian people. I would like to see American libertarians put aside their conservatism, and their xenophobia, and their terror of being somehow contaminated by "leftist" issues and learn to say, with the Egyptian student demonstrators of the early seventies: **We are all Palestinians.**

The corner has been turned. Where the Liberal establishment and the social-democrat Left abandoned moral philosophy to defend Israeli imperialism and Euro-American support with a mixture of unsubstantiated guilt over the German "Holocaust" and pragmatic defense of "Western interests" (i.e. corporate Liberal-owned petroleum interests), the Libertarians moved in with their individual rights absolutism.

Among the States in the world, Palestine won a 142-7 vote in the United Nations, with the entire Common Market abstaining, establishing the right of Palestinians to territory from Israel -- Palestinian land, from which they were thrown off by the Israeli State.

With the world's States and multi-national corporations abandoning the pro-Israeli position, only the American State shores up the Israeli régime. Internally in Israel, the opposi-

tion party is moving towards more compromise even as the governing hard-line coalition disintegrates. And now, in the United States, support for Palestinian liberation moves into ascendancy, and the libertarian movement is the bellwether.

The Old Right remnant of the anti-World War II struggle, the New Left remnants of national liberation struggles of the 1960s, and the pro-Arab special interests are now joined by radical libertarians, the more moderate respectable libertarians (such as LP presidential candidate Ed Clark) and next the border-line libertarian sympathizers of the civil-liberties reform Liberals and free-enterprise conservatives.

There remains a residue of fear from the guilt-by-association tactics of pro-Israel interventionists, strong enough to motivate Editor Childs to prevent the reprinting of Birmingham's article in this JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW. (But take heart, *Libertarian Review* is now running only three years behind *New Libertarian* which freely runs ads for IHR.) Notwithstanding, the historical review is worth historiographical review, and one can always refer to the original: "The Revolution That Will Be," Bill Birmingham, p36, *Libertarian Review*, June 1980, Volume 9, No. 6, $1.50, from 1620 Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Ca 94111.

What Birmingham states, with quotes backing him from Said's book and other sources, is that an indigenous population of Arabs, self-aware as Palestinians (*Filastin Arabiyah*, p38), were held in thrall by the Ottoman Empire, then the British who turned the territory over to the Zionist movement after extensive terrorism by such groups as *Irgun Zvai Leumi* (led by Mehachem Begin and Geula Cohen, the latter being the source of the Knesset resolution making Jerusalem Israel's capital). Arabs were slaughtered, their homes burned, and the rest driven off without recompense as deliberate policy. Thus was the Israeli State founded -- as all others were -- by murder, conquest, and pillage.

Birmingham documents the overt, deep, anti-Arab racism of early Zionists such as Chaim Weizmann (later president of Israel), quotes pro-genocidal passages from the diaries of Zionist leaders, and blatant expressions by those leaders of expropriation -- not liberation -- of Palestinian territory. He has a devastating quote that Said dug up from Moshe Dayan: (p37):

> We came to this country which was already populated by Arabs and we are establishing a Hebrew, that is a Jewish state there. In considerable areas of the country (the total area was about 6 percent -- ES) we bought the lands from the Arabs (or more properly, from their feudal overlords -- BB), Jewish villages were built in the place of Arab villages. You do not know even know the names of these Arab villages, and I do not blame you, **because these geography books no longer exist;** not only do the books not exist, the Arab villages are not there either. Nahalal (Dayan's own village) arose in the place of Mahalul, Gevat -- in the place of Jibra, (Kibbutz) Sarid -- in the place of Haneifs and Kefar Yehosua -- in the place of Tell Shaman. **There is not one place built in this country that did not have a former Arab population.** (Emphasis added.)

To a libertarian, the use of "socialism" to rationalize statist oppression is particularly telling. Birmingham unerringly mines Said for this nugget:

> Another pillar of Zionism was the "conquest of labor," also known as "Jewish socialism." This was a systematic boycott of the Arab economy, and especially of Arab laborers. There is nothing wrong with voluntary boycotts, but there was nothing voluntary about the conquest of labor. "We stood guard at orchards to prevent Arab workers from getting jobs there," confesses David Hacohen, former head of the Jewish trade union *Histradrut*. His minions would also "pour kerosene on Arab tomatoes," and even "attack Jewish housewives in the market and smash the Arab eggs they bought."

And Birmingham does not neglect the "holocaust" in Israel -- of Palestinians, atrocities such as the massacre of 250 men, women and children of Deir Yassin. "Out of about 950,000 Arabs who had lived in what became the new, enlarged Israel, some 780,000 were refugees, giving the new state a solid Jewish majority and all their abandoned property, to which the Israeli government promptly helped itself. It was as President Chaim Weizman put it, "a miraculous simplification of our tasks."

The Arabs remaining in Palestine were segregated and treated like Blacks in South Africa. Arab books, such as Sabri Jiryi's *The Arabs In Israel*, were suppressed and the author

deported. Children's books treating Arabs like Julius Streicher's books treated Jews, were supported and spread.

If there is any flaw in Birmingham's review, it is perhaps in discussing the Palestine Liberation Organization, a nascent State and thus potentially oppressive. Nonetheless, a good deal of the popular description of the PLO as terrorists without popular support belongs with Belgian-baby eating propaganda and worthy of a lot of solid Revisionst exposé.

Birmingham feels there's still a ways to go:

> Unfortunately there are too many libertarians, even though they claim to be the keepers of the classical liberal tradition, who seem quite willing to support the Palestinian cause, or even to acknowledge its justice. True, it is extremely unpopular, and the truth about it well concealed, but obstacles don't stop libertarians from taking equally unpopular and hard to prove positions on a score of domestic issues. Besides, as Dr. Said points out, most of the facts about Palestine and Zionism are readily available; the problem is to connect them, "and see them not as they are hidden, but as they are ignored or denied " (p 40).

But with his review, and the signal of a major victory for justice and liberty in the minds of libertarian intellectuals -- and American intellectuals in general -- success for Palestinian Revisionism -- and Palestinian liberation -- is that much closer.

Nationalism, Racialism and Early British Socialism

RICHARD LAWSON

Modern socialists would be highly embarrassed to learn of the nationalist and racialist attitudes displayed by many early British socialists.

Prominent among these was Robert Blatchford, editor of a newspaper entitled *The Clarion*, and author of *Merrie England (1893)* and *Britain for the British* (1902). (A facsimile reproduction of *Merrie England* was issued in 1976 by the Journeyman Press, from which the following quotations are taken).

Bob Blatchford advocated a form of non-Marxian socialism which he supported by an appeal to ethics and common sense. His ideas relating to communal kitchens and the like are rather quaint by modern standards of affluence and privacy, but it must be remembered that when Blatchford was writing in the 1890s large sections of the British working-class were condemned to grinding poverty and degradation.

It is obvious from Blatchford's writings that his military training had conditioned him to attempt to apply the solutions of war to the problems of peace. A parallel between a military society and a socialist one has been drawn before, and Blatchford's approach was to be echoed by the nationalist movements which blossomed all over Europe in the 1920s and 30s.

What concerns us here, however, is Blatchford's obvious patriotism, his awareness of the biological realities of life, and—as modern socialists would term it—his "racial prejudice." Blatchford was, for example, an enthusiastic advocate of British naval supremacy and a bitter opponent of the IRA rising at Easter 1916. In order to give a proper impression of Blatchford's ideas, however, we can do no better than turn to his vision of *Merrie England.*

Unlike modern socialists who preach the Marxist concept

of absolute economic determinism to the exclusion of all other factors, Blatchford accepted that: "Men are made what they are by two forces: heredity and environment," and continued: "Your intellect and character are at birth what your forefathers made them" (p32).

He also accepted innate differences in national character, praising the British people for being "intelligent, industrious, strong, and famous for their perseverance, their inventiveness and resource" (p2).

While Marxian socialists have an entirely materialistic world outlook, Blatchford specifically attacked *laissez-faire* capitalism for its materialism:

"Your Manchester School treat all social and industrial problems from the standpoint of mere animal subsistence. They do not seem to think that you have any mind. With them it is a question of bread and cheese and be thankful" (p4).

Unlike most modern socialists Blatchford was an advocate of economic nationalism:

> The present national ideal is to become "The Workshop of the World." That is to say, the British people are to manufacture goods for sale to foreign countries, and in return for those goods are to get more money than they could obtain by developing the resources of their own country for their own use.
>
> My ideal is that each individual should seek his advantage in co-operation with his fellows, and that the people should make the best of their own country before attempting to trade with other peoples (pp2-3).

Blatchford's advocacy of economic nationalism was carried over into the agricultural field. In the following passage Blatchford addresses himself to Mr. Smith, an imaginary reader:

> But don't you see, Mr. Smith, that if we lose our power to feed ourselves we destroy the advantages of our insular position? Don't you see that if we destroy our agriculture we destroy our independence at a blow, and become a defenceless nation? Don't you see that the people who depend on foreigners for their food are at the mercy of any ambitious statesman who chooses to make war upon them? (p14).

Unlike modern socialists with their open and subterranean connections to cosmopolitan financiers, Blatchford railed against finance capitalism and characterized the Jew as his favorite example of a usurer who lends money for public works:

> Suppose a rich Jew has lent a million to the Government at 3 per cent. He draws every year £30,000 in interest. Who pays it? It is raised by taxation. Who pays the taxes? They are all paid either by the workers or by those who get their money from the workers. And the Jew gets his interest for ever. That is to say, that after he has drawn back all his million in interest the Government goes on paying him out of your earnings, my hardheaded friend, £30,000 a year as long as any one is left to claim it. Probably the million was wasted in some foolish work, or wicked war; but because a minister in 1812 was a knave or a fool, British industry is taxed to the tune of £30,000 a year, world without end, amen.
>
> And the worst of it is that the money the Jew lent was not earned by him, but by the ancestors of the very people who are now paying his descendants interest for the loan of it (p29).

In at least one reprinted version of *Merrie England* which the writer of this article has seen, the word "Jew" was replaced by "rich man." This is just one small example of the wholesale suppression of the facts about the nationalist and racialist attitudes of early British socialists.

Writing in *The Clarion* Blatchford expressed concern over the influx of "poor unshorn and unsavory children of the Ghetto" into Britain. He said that the number of Jewish aliens in East London was alarming "and their increase appalling." The paper also declared that their habits were "unclean," and that "their presence is often a menace and an injury to the English working classes." (Quoted by Edmund Silberner in "British Socialism and the Jews," *Historia Judaica*, XIV 1952, pp40-41).

Blatchford's economic nationalism was to some extent shared by Pete Curran, the Gas Workers' representative in the Independent Labour Party, though it is important to grasp that the socialists were split over their attitude to the Empire.

While some followed Joe Chamberlain in viewing the Empire as a vital asset, others saw it as a drain on British resources. Perhaps both views had an element of truth in them, but it is beyond the scope of this article to discuss this question. What interests us here is that both views were essentially patriotic. Speaking at a Socialist Congress in 1900 Pete Curran stated:

> Great efforts are now being made in England to convince the Trade Unionists that the Colonial policy is in their interests, for it creates new markets and thereby increases the possibility of work and raises wages. But the English Trade Unionists are not to be caught with those fine words; they answer: so long as there are children in England who go hungry to school, so long as there are workers who wander about in rags and die in wretchedness, the English workers have no interest in exporting to the Colonies the goods they produce. And if the "Jingoes" rejoiced in the fact England has become a great country on which the sun never sets, then I say that in England there are thousands of homes on which the sun has never risen.

The reference to "Jingoes" is related to the Boer War which brought the question of Imperialism to a head, splitting the socialist ranks. While some supported the war out of patriotism, others attacked it as the work of shady financiers. The Fabian Society objected (in George Bernard Shaw's phrase) to "stray little states lying about in the way of great powers," while Bruce Glasier of the Independent Labour Party complained in his diary about the whipping up of war hysteria: "All our civilization seems to fall away . . . Alas, the people seem to have gone back. The *Daily Mail* and the other great Capitalist and Jewish . . . papers have excited madness among them . . ." (The views of H. M. Hyndman and his Social-Democratic Federation are covered later in this article).

Before she was married Beatrice Webb had spent a few weeks in the East End of London as a working girl and investigator of sweated labor. As a result of this research she drew a number of conclusions about the Jews which were published in 1888 in *The Nineteenth Century* magazine.

She stated that "the love of profit as distinct from other

forms of money-earning is the strongest impelling motive of the Jewish race," and that they were deficient in "social morality."

In a treatise entitled *Industrial Democracy* written by Beatrice and her husband, they refer to the Jews in England as "a constant influence for degradation."

George Bernard Shaw, meanwhile, characterized the Jews as "the real enemy, the invader from the East, the Druze, the ruffian, the oriental parasite, in a word the Jew" (*Morning Post* 13 December 1925).

In his book *The Outline of History* (1920) H. G. Wells stated: "The Jews looked for a special saviour, a messiah, who was to redeem mankind by the agreeable process of restoring the fabulous glories of David and Solomon, and bringing the whole world at last under the benevolent but firm Jewish heel."

In *Is Race Conflict Unavoidable?* (1924) he wrote:

> . . . the natural thought forms, and dispositions and instinctive reactions of Northern Europeans and Jews, Negroes and Whites, Indians and Chinese, vary subtly and profoundly, you can no more ignore differences of race than differences of sex. They are things greatly intensified and supplemented by differences of tradition, training and conditions, but when all such modifications are eliminated, essential differences remain.

Of all the early socialists with nationalist and racialist leanings, one of the most genuinely patriotic was the self-confessed but highly enigmatic Marxist, H. M. Hyndman (1842-1921). Hyndman, whose family was of Ulster Scots origin, was originally a "Tory Radical." As a young man he was sympathetic to the Italian nationalist struggle, the *Risorgimento*, and became interested in greater unification between Britain, Australia and Canada. He may have been influenced in this by his Cambridge contemporary, Charles Dilke, whose *Greater Britain* was published in 1868.

Hyndman gradually took a greater and greater interest in socialism, however, and in January 1881 he wrote an article

in *The Nineteenth Century* magazine entitled "The Dawn of a Revolutionary Epoch." This made some interesting revelations on the role of Jews both in the "Establishment" and in revolutionary movements:

> The influence of the Jews at the present time is more noticeable than ever . . . They are at the head of European capitalists . . . In politics many Jews are in the front rank. The press in more than one European capital is almost wholly in their hands. The Rothschilds are but the leading name among a whole series of capitalists . . . But while on one hand the Jews are thus beyond dispute the leaders of the plutocracy of Europe . . . another section of the same race form the leaders of that revolutionary propaganda which is making way against that very capitalist class represented by their own fellow-Jews. Jews—more than any other men—have held forth against those who make their living not by producing value but by trading on the differences of value; they at this moment are acting as the leaders in the revolutionary movement which I have endeavored to trace. Surely we have here a very strange phenomenon . . . Those, therefore, who are accustomed to look upon all Jews as essentially practical and conservative, as certain, too, to enlist on the side of the prevailing social system, will be obliged to reconsider their conclusions. But the whole subject of the bad and good effects of Jewish influence on European social conditions is worthy of a more thorough investigation than can be undertaken here. Enough, that in the period we are approaching not the slightest influence on the side of revolution will be that of the Jew.

Later in the same year Hyndman founded the Democratic Federation, which changed its name to the Social-Democratic Federation in 1884, to the Social-Democratic Party in 1907, and effectively became the British Socialist Party in 1911.

Throughout the rest of his political career Hyndman considered himself to be a Marxist, though Marx was jealously contemptuous of him and Engels hostile. It was perhaps the crowning irony of Hyndman's life that he should have continued to describe himself as a disciple of a Jew, when his attitude to the Jews as a group became less and less ambiguous and more and more openly critical.

Hyndman condemned the Jameson raid as a "piratical expedition" bankrolled by "the most loathsome set of Jew

capitalists and Christian financiers." (*H. M. Hyndman and British Socialism* by Chushichi Tsuzuki, Oxford University Press, 1961, p126).

When the Boer War finally broke out he described it as "the Jews' War" and as an "abominable war on behalf of German-Jew mineowners and other international interlopers." At a London meeting in 1900 he spoke so forcefully of the "Jewish International" that a motion of censure was tabled for the forthcoming party conference (*Ibid.* p128).

Hyndman was disturbed by the election to the Federation's executive in 1900 of Theodore Rothstein, a Jewish emigré from Russia. It was Rothstein and Zelda Kahan, who was also of Russian-Jewish origin, who led the opposition to Hyndman's growing mistrust of German ambitions and the support given to them by German-Jewish socialists.

In a private letter dated 9 May 1905 Hyndman complained that: " . . . among certain cliques it is as as inadmissable to criticize the Germans in Socialism as it is to point out that Jews have their drawbacks" (*Ibid.* p199).

The struggle with Rothstein had a strange sequel for during the subsequent Great War Hyndman got hold of a list of Foreign Office employees which included Rothstein's name: "What was my amazement and horror," wrote Hyndman, "to find among them the name of Th. Rothstein, a Russian-German Jew, who has been working here for years in and out of the Socialist movement . . . for and on behalf of Germany" (*Ibid.* p244).

In the pre-War period the Labor Party in the House of Commons opposed British rearmament, but Hyndman advocated it particularly with regard to the navy. He accused the Labor Party of wanting only "a sham defense" which was "worse than no defense at all" (*Ibid.* p210). Kahan and Rothstein naturally agitated against him.

In the 3 September 1910 issue of his paper *Justice*, Hyndman wrote of:

> . . . the right and duty of this nationality to maintain its independence, even under capitalism . . . There is no mistake about that. If this is to be a jingo, then I am a jingo; if this is to be a bourgeois, then I

> am a bourgeois, if this is to be an opponent of organized Socialist opinion, then I am an opponent of organized Socialist opinion.

It is obvious from the above passage that Hyndman, although a self-proclaimed "Marxist," was first and foremost a patriot, and only secondly a socialist; while his "internationalism" stopped short of internationalism!

In 1911 the transformation of the SDP into the BSP with added elements who had left the Independent Labour Party, gave Zelda Kahan and her supporters a majority on the new executive in favor of disarmament. Hyndman threatened to resign while one of his supporters, Victor Fisher, actually did so, denouncing Kahan and "comrades alien in blood and race" (*Ibid.* p213).

In Ireland, meanwhile, the Ulster Loyalists were arming to resist Irish Home Rule, and Hyndman welcomed "the bold front shown by the Ulstermen" (*Ibid.* p189). Events there were soon overshadowed by the European conflict, however.

When the First World War broke out Hyndman drafted a manifesto declaring that Britain had no interest in the quarrel, but once Britain was itself at war Hyndman came out strongly in support of his own country. His hold on the party weakened, however, when a member of the executive who supported the war volunteered for military service, and was replaced by an internationalist, J. Fineberg, another Russian Jew. This was deplored by Hyndman's supporters who attacked "the pro-German attitude of several Russo-Jewish refugees" (*Ibid.* p225).

Victor Fisher who had earlier been reconciled with the BSP repudiated it entirely as being dominated by the internationalist and thus unpatriotic outlook of exiles. In April 1915 Fisher formed a Socialist National Defense Committee which included Blatchford and H. G. Wells. It advanced the cause of "Britain for the British," an echo of Blatchford's 1902 pamphlet, and attacked the anti-War "pseudo-Socialists" who were "aliens by birth, blood or sentiment" (*Ibid.* p233). This committee later became the British Workers' National League and later still the National Democratic Party.

Hyndman, meanwhile, split away from the BSP in April

1916, and soon after formed the National Socialist Party. Amongst its leading personalities was the patriotic Adolphe Smith, who collaborated with the authoress Nesta Webster in her once famous exposés of that peculiar alliance between capitalism, bolshevism and German imperialism.

Hyndman was sympahetic to Kerensky and the social revolutionaries who wanted to pursue the war, but bitterly opposed to the bolsheviks. He later denounced Lenin as "a communist Ivan the Terrible," and described the bolshevik regime as "autocratic, cruel and butcherly to the last degree" (*Ibid.* p239). He supported Allied intervention against the bolsheviks, provided support was given only to those who opposed both bolshevism and czarism.

In May 1917 Hyndman attacked Karl Marx's grandson, Jean Longuet, the leading pacifist in the French Socialist Party. Hyndman concluded: "Of late the Jewish blood in him had been manifesting itself chiefly in love for intrigue" (*Ibid.* p244).

When peace came the NSP advocated that Hyndman should act as a British representative at the Peace Conference, a suggestion which was supported by the conservative *Morning Post* which, incidentally, did a great deal to expose the real nature of bolshevism. The paper praised him as "a sound Patriot—an Englishman who does not allow his socialism or his democratic passion to produce anti-nationalism," (*Morning Post*, 28 November 1918).

It need hardly be pointed out that the conservative *Morning Post* and the socialist H. M. Hyndman are both far removed from their modern counterparts today.

Hyndman was to have little role to play in the post-War world, and he died after a short illness in November 1921. In March 1922 a Hyndman Memorial Committee was set up whose members included Bernard Shaw and Wickham Steed, editor of *The Times*. The position of Wickham Steed was somewhat analogous to that of the *Morning Post*. In his memoirs, *Through Thirty Years* (Heinemann, 1924), Steed suggested that President Wilson's demand for recognition of bolshevik Russia at the Peace Conference was motivated by "Jacob Schiff, Warburg and other international financiers

who wished above all to bolster the Jewish bolshevists to secure a field for German and Jewish exploitation of Russia."

What Hyndman shared in common with both the *Morning Post* and Wickham Steed was a common ethnic loyalty which transcended their political differences. It was in essence a mirror image of that opposing ethnic thread which joined international finance and bolshevism, and it was to foreshadow the development of the new political patterns of the 1920s and 30s.

In retrospect the First World War, like the Second was a cataclysmic tragedy which all true patriots have come to deplore. At the time, though, support for the war was the mark of a patriot, and it is in that light that the attitude of these pro-war socialist pioneers must be seen.

The obvious patriotism and candid racialism of these early socialists is in marked contrast to the attitudes and views held by socialists today. The triumph of internationalism and the change from an open-minded and well-meaning approach to a mindless religious fanaticism is a reflection of the changing genetic complexion of socialism's own advocates.

Auschwitz Notebook

DITLIEB FELDERER

Doors & Portholes

As I illustrated with my slide presentation at the 1980 Revisionist Convention at Pomona College, Claremont, California, one of the most blatant examples of Holocaust forgery is in the access to the "gas chambers."

Auschwitz I

At Auschwitz I there are no less than five doors or doorways giving access to the "gas chamber." There are double doors (i.e with a small lobby) at each end of the room, and one doorway off to the inside, which leads into the crematory area. However, this latter doorway **has no door** and shows no sign of ever having borne one. This alone would seem to rule out the possibility of the room being used to gas people. Either the people would have escaped through the (doorless) doorway, or the gas would have flowed out the same way and either gassed the crematory workers and/or exploded with the heat.

At the end facing the gallows (where Rudolf Höss met his end after "confessing" to all kinds of atrocities at Auschwitz) the outside door is rather strange. It is made of light masonite board and tin-plate, and the locking or barring mechanism is on the inside. This would seem to indicate that the gassees locked **themselves** in. The door is so flimsy that a child could knock a fist through it. The porthole in the door (whose glass was broken when we visited) gives a very fine view, not of the interior of the room, but of the lobby wall about one meter away from the door. In no way could this door be described as "hermetically-sealed."

Likewise, the inner door of this lobby is incredibly flimsy. The doorhandle and lock look as if they came out of a Polish farmhouse. This door is made entirely of wood.

We guessed that these two doors had been added or altered after the war, and our discussions with the camp staff in 1979 confirmed this.

Standing inside the room, we can see another door at the far end. The doorposts are made of wood, and the door itself is made of wood and glass. The handle and lock are so weak that they keep falling apart. The door opens inwards, into the "gas chamber." When we asked Mr. T. Szymanski, the (now retired) curator, how it was that the gassees did not just smash the window in this door and escape, he advised us that he had never investigated this door so he could not give us a definite answer!

The outside door at this far end is a definite fake. It is made of masonite, unlike the other three doors, it opens outwards, and has a round porthole. We **know** that this door has been altered three times by referring to various Auschwitz guide books over the years. The first door appeared in *Oswiecim* (*10*, p197) and seems to be the original 1946 door. There are nine horizontal wooden slats in this original door, and no porthole. The second door appears in *We Have Not Forgotten* (*6*, p88), which was published in 1961. This door had an iron bar added to the upper part of the door, plus a **square** porthole.

Birkenau (Auschwitz II)

Confusion reigns here again. A model of Birkenau which is on display at Auschwitz a couple of miles away transposes many of the rooms. Un/dressing rooms become the gas chamber, and vice versa. Likewise, the book *Oswiecim* (*10*, p200) blatantly makes the transposition. Unfortunately, it is not possible to totally check these allegations forensically, since the Germans are supposed to have blown up the business part of all the Birkenau gas chambers shortly before the camp was evacuated in 1945. The four installations are numbered 2 through 5 (with 1 being the number given to the gas chamber/crematorium at nearby Auschwitz proper). The entire building of Crematory 4 has disappeared except for the foundations. Crematory 5, its "mirror image" next to it, has also been

damaged somewhat. Crematories 2 and 3 are partly destroyed, but there still remain a couple of buildings which I was able to explore inside. My report was published in the previous issue of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW.

An exhibit on display in front of Crematory 2 shows a plan of the alleged building, with a text in Polish, English, French and Russian (but not German). The English text reads:

CREMATORIUM II, ACTIWE *[sic]* SINCE
SPRING 1943, WITH GAS CHAMBER AND OVENS
TO BURN CORPSES IN. IN ORDER TO
CAMOUFLAGE THE CRIMES PERPETRATED
THERE THE TERRAIN OF THE CREMATORIUM
WAS SCREENED WITH POPLARS.

COMMENT:
1. UNDRESSING ROOM
2. GAS CHAMBER WHERE CIRCA 2000 PEOPLE WERE KILLED SIMULTANEOUSLY.
3. ELECTRIC LIFT FOR TRANSPORTING BODIES FROM GAS CHAMBER TO THE HALL WITH OVENS.
4. ROOM WHERE HAIR WAS CUT AND GOLD CAPPED TEETH EXTRACTED.
5. HALL WITH CREMATING OVENS.
6. OVEN IN WHICH PERSONAL DOCUMENTS OF THE KILLED WERE BURNED.

The plan on this display often transposes the rooms in contradiction to the model over at Auschwitz I. There is no trace whatsoever of any furnaces, chimneys, sliding doors, screwlids, perforated sheetmetal columns, electric lifts, or any other Holocaust props. The original German construction plans are kept under lock and key, so there is no way of knowing for sure if these were ordinary crematoria, or whether they were air-raid shelters or potato storage bunkers. My guess is that they were indeed ordinary crematoria, and that they were dismantled and then partly demolished by the Soviet liberators.

The only one of these four structures which has walls still standing is Crematory 2. The Exterminationists allege that the victims would descend a few steps into the un/dressing

room and then they would be gassed next door and burned. However, the "gas chamber" section does not have a door! The gassees would appear to have been spirited through brick and concrete walls. Such are the magickal possibilities in the Holocaust pantomime.

Majdanek

At the Majdanek "gas chamber" we find two sturdy metal doors, each resting on three hinges, fastened onto the metal frame. Both doors have a porthole. There is a bluish color around the door frame, which we shall discuss further below. By comparing pictures of this structure in *76*, p48 and *88*, p30 it is quite evident that the building has been altered. In both these pictures the roof above the doors is missing.

When we visited Majdanek (Lublin) we discovered that the bluish color around the doorposts had been artificially applied. We discovered this by examining the total area of blue coloration. We found that not only were the walls of the "gas chamber" colored blue, but so too were the legs of a modern signpost adjacent to the doorway. We took a scraping of this coloring for forensic examination in Sweden.

Stutthof

It is important to bear in mind that we cannot in the least depend on the present appearance of Stutthof's "gas chamber." It may be that the entire building has been erected post-war, but in any case we do have definite evidence of alteration at least. There are two main sources for this:

First we have the 1960 photo in the book *We Have Not Forgotten* (*2*, pp108-109). This is quite different from the 1969 picture of the same "gas chamber" in *Stutthof Guide Informateur* (*72*, p68). The brickwork is entirely different from one book to the other; and what is more, both are different again from the present day structure. Over the years, the doors have been made more and more heavy, in an effort to create some "gas chamber" window-dressing. There are no portholes.

Paradoxically, the Polish government's *12* book tells us on page 70 that "Stutthof had no gas chambers."

Dachau

Despite recurrent claims in the popular newspapers, not even the Exterminationists maintain that anyone was gassed at Dachau. The guru of Exterminationist adherents, Simon Wiesenthal, wrote to *Books & Bookmen* (April 1975) to state that there were no extermination camps on German soil. Martin Broszat, enigmatic head of the IHR's look-alike in Munich, the Institute for Contemporary History, wrote to *Die Zeit* on 26 August 1960 to say the same thing.

The installations on display at Dachau today are quite obviously fumigation closets for clothing. A photo appears in both Butz's definitive *opus (109)* and in Richard Harwood's marvelously readable *Nuremberg Trials (130)*. The inscription on the door about "Gassing Times . . . ." and "Deadly Danger!" would seem to so obviously disprove the extermination function that one wonders at any of the American liberators ever being taken in -- even taking into account the Americans' renowned lack of linguistic ability.

Needless to say, fumigation closets do not need peepholes or "screw-tight mushroom lids" on the roof, and the "liberated" West Germans have not shown the same "poetic license" that their Polish counterparts have, in adding little bits here and there to "help educate backward people" about the "gas chambers."

Bibliography

2. Mazur, *et al.*, *1939-1945 We Have Not Forgotten*, Warsaw, 1960.
6. Mazur, *et al.*, *1939-1945 We Have Not Forgotten*, Warsaw, 1961, (abridged edition: 160pp).
10. Michalek, *Oswiecim*, Warsaw, 1977.
12. Datner, *et al.*, *Genocide 1939-1945*, Warsaw, 1962.
72. Deregowski, *Stutthof Guide Informateur*, Stutthof, 1969.

76. Gryn, *et al.*, *Camp de Concentration de Majdanek*, Lublin, 1966.
88. Marsalek, *et al.*, *Majdanek*, Lublin, 1971.
109. Arthur Butz, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, IHR, 1980
130. Richard Harwood, *Nuremberg & Other War Crimes Trials*, IHR, 1978.

Book Reviews

THE SECRET BETRAYAL, Nikolai Tolstoy, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1978, 503pp, hardback, available from IHR at $16.00. ISBN: 0-684-15635-0.

From 1943 until early 1947 Western countries, led by Britain and the United States, returned nearly two and a half million prisoners of war and refugees to the Soviet Union, regardless of their individual wishes. Additional thousands of old émigrés (people who had fled Russia after the Bolshevik Revolution and the Civil War) were also forcibly sent to the USSR, along with other people of Russian descent who had never lived within the borders of Russia.

The forced repatriation of Russians at the end of World War II has been dealt with in several books that appeared before Count Tolstoy's book was published in Britain in 1977 under the title of *Victims of Yalta*. One of the first studies of this grim episode was Peter Huxley-Blythe's *The East Came West* (The Caxton Printers, 1964). The late Julius Epstein, of the Hoover Institution, twice went to court in an effort to dislodge records relating to this topic. His findings appeared in 1973 with the publication of *Operation Keelhaul: The Story of Forced Repatriation from 1944 to the Present* (Devin-Adair). A year later Nicholas Bethell's *The Last Secret: Forcible Repatriation to Russia 1944-7* (Basic Books, 1974) was published in Britain and the United States. *The Secret Betrayal* is the most complete account of forced repatriation to appear thus far. Between 1971 and 1978 pertinent government records were declassified and the book has a firm foundation in British archival records, as well as a wealth of information gained by interviews and correspondence with policy-makers, military officers who conducted repatriation operations, and a few of the victims who managed to survive the ordeal. This is a thoroughly documented account of the British role in repatriation.

With the invasion of Western Europe in June 1944, thousands of Russian prisoners fell into the hands of the Allies. Many were forced laborers who had been working on the Atlantic Wall for the *Todt* Organization. Others were simply refugees. However, the Western Allies were surprised to discover that thousands had willingly joined the *Wehrmacht*. Soviet Foreign Minister Molotov asserted in May 1944 that the number of Russians serving in the

German armed forces was "insignificant." Actually, approximately one million of Stalin's subjects had joined the other side.

By late June the British Foreign Office decided to repatriate all Russian POWs, callously disregarding the consequences of such a policy (early in the war Stalin had made it clear that any Soviet citizens who were even temporarily out of Communist control would be regarded as traitors. Official Orders threatened "deserters" and POWs with draconian measures). On 24 June 1944, Patrick Dean, the Assistant Legal Adviser of the Foreign Office, declared: "In due course all those with whom the Soviet authorities desire to deal must . . . be handed over to them, and we are not concerned with the fact that they may be shot or otherwise more harshly dealt with than they might be under English law."

The War Office held a different view. Britain's SOE (Special Operations Executive, an organization created in November 1940 to encourage, direct, and supply resistance groups in countries occupied by the Axis) had distributed leaflets to Russians in the German armed forces promising that Russians surrendering to the Allies could receive political asylum if they wished. Despite stiff protests, the military was unable to prevail upon the Foreign Office to reverse its unilateral decision to return **all** Russians to Soviet authorities.

British Foreign Minister Anthony Eden, who, Tolstoy reports, "was responsible for initiating the whole policy," first reached agreement with the Soviets on repatriation at the Moscow Conference in October 1944. The United States joined with Britain and the Soviet Union in reaffirming the program of repatriating Russians at the Yalta Conference. However, nothing in the agreement on POWs referred to the return of Soviet citizens who were unwilling to go back to the USSR. Nor did it provide that those who had never been citizens of the USSR should be delivered to Stalin.

During the summer of 1944 the British began to ship thousands of Russians from POW and refugee camps to the USSR. When informed of their destination, many of the prisoners committed suicide. The Foreign Office did what it could to suppress news of the suicides because, warned Patrick Dean, "these suicides might possibly cause political trouble [in Britain]."

British officers who delivered prisoners to Soviet ports, such as Murmansk and Odessa, witnessed NKVD execution squads murder Russians as they left ship. Responding to a plea that mercy be shown to those who did not wish to return to the Soviet Union, Eden wrote that the "provisions of the Crimean Agreement" had to be upheld, for "we cannot afford to be sentimental."

By the time the war in Europe ended in May 1945, over two million Russians had surrendered to British and American forces. Soviet Repatriation Commissions were established throughout Western Europe, staffed by agents of the NKVD and SMERSH. In some instances, the Soviet officials intimated that Stalin had proclaimed a total amnesty. Large numbers of Russians who had been POWs or slave laborers welcomed the opportunity to return to their homes and loved ones and they willfully went back to the Soviet Union. Thousands of others, however, had an idea of what the consequences would be if they fell into the hands of Stalin's agents. Some claimed the protection of the Geneva Convention regarding prisoners of war. Others hoped to be resettled in a non-Communist part of the world.

The British resorted to various ruses in an effort to repatriate anti-Communist elements as easily as possible. For example, at the close of the war, around 50,000 Cassacks were in British-controlled parts of Austria. Along with about 100,000 Georgians, various Cossack tribes had fought with the Germans against the Soviets and, with their families, retreated westward as the Third Reich collapsed. When repatriating the members of the 15th Cossack Cavalry Corps, the British deceived them by telling them that they would first be sent to Italy and ultimately to Canada. In other instances it was necessary to set troops upon the unarmed men, women, children, forcing them into trucks or railroad cars. As they were being rounded up, many displayed documents proving that they were citizens of France, Italy, Yugoslavia, or registered stateless with Nanssen passports issued by the League of Nations.

Chapter eleven, entitled "An Unsolved Mystery," attempts to unravel one of the most appalling incidents in the repatriation story, the handing over to Stalin of long-time opponents of the Soviet régime who technically were exempt from repatriation because of the fact that they had never been Soviet citizens. The agreed upon definition of a "Soviet citizen" was "a person born or resident within the pre 1 September 1939 boundaries of Russia (who had not acquired another nationality -- or a Nanssen passport, which would render the subject Stateless) . . ." By this definition thousands who had fled Russia during the Civil War and who found themselves under British control at the end of the Second World War should not have been sent to the USSR. Among the thousands delivered to Stalin was 76 year old Czarist General Peter Krasnov; Andrei Shkuro, a cavalry leader who had fought for the Czar and had been decorated by the British in the First World War and who fought with the German 1st Cossack Cavalry Division in the Second World War; and Sultan Kelech Ghirey, leader of the

Caucasians. British officers informed these men that they were requested to attend a meeting with Field Marshal Alexander. They boarded trucks and were then turned over to Soviet authorites in Austria. As Tolstoy relates: "Even the Soviet authorities who received them were astonished that the British should have included these people in the consignment. At Judenberg (the delivery point in Austria) the Red Army General Dolmatov asked in surprise why the old émigrés had been handed over: to his knowledge the Soviet authorities had never demanded them. NKVD interrogators were frankly incredulous." Most of the older émigrés had fought as Allies of the British in the First World War. On 12 January 1947, Generals Krasnov and Shkuro, along with the German commander of the 15th Cossack Cavalry Division, General Helmuth von Pannwitz, were executed, after having spent nineteen months in the infamous Lubianka Prison. Most of the other Cossack and German officers of the Cossack units were also executed. "In this way," the author explains, "the British Government had in essence sentenced to death without trial German officers who had been received by them as prisoners of war."

Brigadier Geoffrey Musson, who delivered these Cossacks to the Soviets, told the author that he received **oral** orders from his superiors compelling him to return all the Cossacks under his control, regardless of their actual nationality. Some documents relating to this particular incident remain classified and other have "mysteriously disappeared." Tolstoy is confident that "the handover of Krasnov and Shkuro in particular, and the officers at Lienz in general, was no blunder committed by some hard-pressed staff officer in a moment of stress, but a carefully planned operation . . . The motive presumably was to co-operate with Soviet forces in Austria."

Military officers ordered to enforce repatriation were often surprised at the alarm expressed by the refugees when they learned that they were to be shipped eastward. Lt. Michael Bayley related how Russian peasants who had been working as slave laborers on German farms begged to be allowed to stay in Germany. The perplexed British officer was told by members of the Polish Armored Division that "of course the Russian peasants were better off in Germany -- why couldn't we let well enough alone." Another officer explained that he and his fellow officers believed the Cossacks' fears to be groundless. British wartime propaganda had portrayed the USSR as being "a kind of utopian socialist state . . . and that they would behave compassionately towards these people whom we were deputed to send back." Throughout the war there had been a blackout of news unfavorable to the Soviet system, thus

it was hardly surprising that the military men detailed to enforce repatriation felt that the USSR was governed by the Four Freedoms, and that Russian refugees consequently had little to fear from their own government.

Protests against the repatriation policy were being raised by the summer of 1945. The Commander of the 2nd Polish Corps, General Anders, complained that the Soviets were trying to kidnap Polish citizens. On 5 July 1945, the Vatican sent a plea to the British Foreign Office and the U.S. State Department that thousands of Ukrainians in the West should not be sent back. John Galsworthy of the Foreign Office minuted: "We do not wish to attract attention to this aspect of the Agreement which is, of course, in oppostion to our traditional attitude towards political refugees . . . "

Other objections were raised by Allied occupation commanders. In Italy, Field Marshal Alexander finally told a Soviet Repatriation Mission under General Basilov that he would not be allowed to bully unwilling Ukrainians into returning to Russia. General Eisenhower likewise viewed with distaste the use of force against helpless Russian refugees and POWs. He placed a temporary freeze on repatriation operations and asked his superiors in Washington for a definite ruling on the issue. Field Marshal Montgomery followed suit and in the Fall of 1945 ordered that force no longer be used for the repatriation of Soviet nationals. The American and British governments thus assumed the onus for continuing the repatriation policy. Galsworthy of the Foreign Office wrote, "We made up our minds long ago that we could not try to save Russians from their Government, however much we might wish to do so on purely humanitarian grounds."

Apologists for the forced repatriation policy have claimed, without evidence, that "Stalin might have contemplated holding liberated British prisoners hostage." Why then were hundreds of thousands of Russians forcibly repatriated after all the British and American prisoners liberated by the Red Army in eastern Germany were returned to the West? Tolstoy believed that the Allied diplomats wanted to continue to co-operate with the Soviets in building a new post-war world order. "Suggestions that the Soviet Union could represent a potential threat, however ably presented, were ridiculed . . . Foreign Office officials held that Stalin's intentions towards the West were beneficent, and that to work in cooperation with him was . . . essential to British interests. The fate of the Russians whose return they enforced was an unfortunate but unavoidable sacrifice to the greater aim."

Nikolai Tolstoy has proven that the British were guilty of flouting the principles of British law and the Geneva Convention. The

one shortcoming of the book is Tolstoy's lack of emphasis on the role played by the United States government in the repatriation policy. Despite this flaw, Tolstoy has written a book which sheds considerable new light on one of the most tragic episodes of the twentieth century.

CHARLES LUTTON

THE CRIME OF MOSCOW IN VYNNYTSIA, Introduction by John F. Stewart, Preface by Lewis Brandon, Institute for Historical Review, 1980, 48 pp, paperback, $3.00 from IHR. ISBN: 0-911038-90-6.

In 1943 the German occupation authorities in Ukraine discovered the bodies of 9,439 victims of the Soviet NKVD.

The victims were all Ukrainian dissidents, who had been rounded up by the Soviets during 1937-39; before the German invasion. The Germans discovered their bodies under an orchard, under a children's playground, and in a park.

The Germans brought together an International Commission of forensic experts from eleven different European countries; Allied, Axis and neutral.

The forensic experts examined the bodies, and found as follows:

- All male corpses had their hands tied behind their back, and had been shot in the back of the head.
- 60 corpses had also been bludgeoned, indicating that the original gunshot had not killed them outright.
- Three female corpses were nude, and did not have their hands tied, indicating probable sexual interference.
- The clothing on the victims indicated that they were all working class or peasants.
- One victim, at least, had soil in his stomach, indicating that he had been buried alive.

In an uncanny re-enactment of the German discovery of the Katyn Forest murders of 14,500 Poles, the Germans had to hastily rebury the bodies and retreat before advanced Red armies. As with the Katyn affair, the Bulgarian member of the International Commission was captured by the Soviets. However, in this case the Bulgarian did not renege on his testimony; he was executed. Neither did the Soviets try to pin the blame for the Ukrainian deaths on the Germans; there was no way that even the double-talking Communists could have construed such a lie.

In the end, the entire affair was covered over, along with the corpses themselves. It was not until 1951 that a brave group of Ukrainian expatriates and sympathizers in the West published this 48-page booklet exposing the atrocity for all to witness. But even this brave voice crying in the détente wilderness would have faded away, had it not been for the efforts of the Institute for Historical Review.

Thanks are due to the Vynnytsia Remembrance Committee, headed by Dr. Jaroslaw Sawka, for their encouragement and guidance in the bringing about of this much-need production.

LB

GENOCIDE IN THE HOLY LAND, Rabbi Moshe Schonfeld, Neturei Karta of the U.S.A., PO Box 2143, Brooklyn, NY 11202, 570pp, paperback $8.00.

Genocide in the Holy Land by Rabbi Moshe Schonfeld is a worthy sequel to the same author's *The Holocaust Victims Accuse.* Rabbi Schonfeld presents a documented account of the destruction by the Zionists of Middle Eastern and North African Jewry. Although the book focuses on the plight of Yemenite Jews there is also considerble material on the uprooting of the Jews of Iraq, Iran and Algeria. Rabbi Schonfeld relates a sorry tale of kidnapping, murder and religious persecution and the book is a damning indictment of the "secular Socialist" Zionist state. Although many readers may not accept Rabbi Schonfeld's dogmatic Jewish Orthodox biases nonetheless this book is essential reading for those wishing to gain knowledge of what really took place in the "bastion of democracy," Israel.

BEZALEL CHAIM

THE FASCIST EGO: A POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY OF ROBERT BRASILLACH, William R. Tucker, University of California Press, 341 pp, hardback $22.95. ISBN: 0-520-027108

Robert Brasillach, one of the most promising literary critics, novelists, poets and journalists of the thirties, was condemned in a French courtroom of collaboration with the Germans and was executed in 1945, despite pleas for clemency to DeGaulle by such

notables as Albert Camus, Francois Mauriac, Jean Cocteau, Colette, Gabriel Marcel, Jacques Rueff, Paul Valery, Georges Duhamel, Arthur Honegger, Jean-Louis Barrault, Paul Claudel, and others.

The author, a member of the Department of Government, Lamar University in Beaumont, Texas, sees in Brasillach's involvement with fascism "a form of anarchic individualism or right-wing anarchism . . .and far from being a form of social or moral conservatism, Brasillach's fascism was inspired by an anti-modernism that placed the creative individual's sensibilities and his ego at the center of things. Brasillach's fear that the individualist prerogatives of the creative elite would be submerged in the industrialized and rationalized society that loomed on the horizon was important as a basis for his thoughts and actions."

Professor Tucker's attempt to link anarchism and fascism is not very successful but his book is an indispensable source for an understanding of Fascist ideology. Ultimately, like most academics, Professor Tucker is trapped by the "lock-step" reflexes of the last forty years but the issues he raises in the book are well-worth discussing.

BEZALEL CHAIM

THE OTHER HOLOCAUST: MANY CIRCLES OF HELL, Bohdan Wytwycky, Novak, 1980, 918 F Street NW #410, Washington, DC 20004, 96pp, paperback. ISBN: not given.

The inevitable has happened. Exterminationist circles are viciously divided as to "whose Holocaust is it anyway?"

This Ukrainian author has sought to hitch a ride on the Holocaust gravy-train, by addressing the issue of the 9-10 million (or as some say, 5 million) "Others" who perished along with the magickal six million Jews. The reaction has been polarized.

Rabbi Seymour Siegel of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America says that "There is a brotherhood of suffering. Dr. Wytwycky's work helps create that brotherhood."

Professor Jacob Neusner of Brown University enthuses: "I certainly endorse this document, which is objective and factual, and which deserves the widest circulation."

Michael Berenbaum, Head Holocauster at the President'c Commission on the Holocaust (see book review on pages 174-177 of our Summer 1980 issue) is not so sure as to the ideologically correct line to take. He agrees that "Wytwycky has begun a critically

important task" but that he has some "philosophical and methodological reservations" about the book. The main reservation he has is that he would have liked "to have seen his keen intellect probe the critical and unavoidable question of the collaboration with the Nazis of the other victims of their oppression in murdering Jews, sharing with their enemy the most central goal -- the extermination of the Jewish people." Such is the paranoid world of the professional Exterminationist that he identifies the non-Jewish *exterminatees* as *exterminators*.

Indeed, Berenbaum's Holocaust Commission, under the guruship of survivor *extraordinaire* Elie Wiesel, has exhibited a considerable amount of anxiety on this vexed question. (Maybe these were the "nocturnal obesssions and complexes" that Wiesel refers to in his revealing introduction to his *Report?)* The commission gnashed its collective teeth over whether or not all those "Others" should be included in any Holocaust memorializing. They lurched this way and that way, endeavoring to placate all those "Others" who sought to elevate themselves to the same pinnacle of aloofness from criticism which is enjoyed by the Tiny Remnant of Jewish survivors. (Not least among these "Others" was, of course, the unsavory collection of Negro child-molestors and renegade Poles who had been co-opted onto the Commission as "window dressing" to make it appear that it was not a **totally** Jewish operation.)

The slightest move by the Commission to memorialize the "Others" brought down condemnation and rebuke from the lofty towers of Jewish academia. The most vitriolic attack on this Holocaust universalizing came from Prof. Yehuda Bauer, writing in the Chicago *Sentinel* of May 1980 and the *Australian Jewish News* of 18 April 1980:

> In this [President Carter's] most disturbing statement, the Holocaust is re-defined to include the sum total of all the atrocities committed by the Nazis . . . The Holocaust in this view is no longer a unique historical event . . . but a hold-all term for "the inhumanity of man to man," and similar generalizations. Not only were the six million Jews murdered by their enemies; they now stand in danger of having their unique martyrdom obliterated by their friends.
>
> Jews . . . were killed for the crime of being born. Their destruction was a sacral act. Even the method of their murder after 1941 -- gassing -- was different: only a few thousand gypsies and a smaller number of Soviet prisoners of war shared the fate of millions of Jews. The place of the Jews in the Nazi world was unique, and was related to the unique history of the Jewish people and their historical relationship to the non-Jewish world.

> The fact that a U.S. administration must necessarily be under political pressure from the many groups that make up the American nation who now, paradoxically, appear to envy the Jews "their" Holocaust, is tragic, or infuriating, or sad.

Bauer's essay was also quoted at length in the Baltimore *News American* of 11 May 1980, by Gary Rosenblatt, editor of the Baltimore *Jewish Times*. Rosenblatt anguished over the construction of Baltimore's own Holocaust Memorial at the Inner Harbor, worrying whether or not it should refer to "Others." He noted that many Baltimore Jewish groups felt that a universalized inscription would be "watered down" and "trivialized" if it were to include all who died. Such, it seems, is the arrogance of the Tiny Remnant, that the alleged deaths of 9-10 million people (or as some say, 5 million) are "trivia" compared to the alleged deaths of six million (or as Raul Hilberg says, 5.4 million; or as Gerald Reitlinger says, 4.6 million) just because they do not happen to be of the Jewish faith!

Happily for Bohdan Wytwycky, such conflicts between "unique, sacral acts" on the one hand, and "trivial, universalized" grab bags of inhumanitarianism on the other, are transmitted at an altitude far above his helotic sandbox.

It is virtually impossible to provide a critique of the content of his book, because it presents so very little information. Most of the text is editorializing and unreferenced *ad hominem* arguments. The few references there are, are hilarious in their feeble attempt to appear academic. Not only are we referred to the communist-written faked confessions of Höss, the commandant of Auschwitz; the publishers cannot even get his first name right! (He is referred to as Karl instead of Rudolf.)

Later, on page 49, we are referred to the memoirs of a Pole who "miraculously survived" for four years at various camps, despite "the average life expectancy" being "about three weeks."

Probably the most telling paragraph in the entire book is on page 52, where the author cites as a source (apparently the only one) for his "10 million" victims, not the German *Einsatzgruppen* records, not the German concentration camp records, not even Polish or Soviet communist historians, but . . . the New York *Saturday Evening Post*, 27 January 1945! Perhaps Mr. Wytwycky would have been better off peddling his manuscript on Madison Avenue; it would have been much more suited there than among the ivyed cloisters of our seats of learning.

LB

About the Contributors

Lewis Brandon is the Director of the Institute for Historical Review.

Dr. Arthur Butz was born and raised in New York City. He received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and his Ph.D. in Control Sciences from the University of Minnesota in 1965. In 1966 he joined the faculty at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois, where he is now Associate Professor of Electrical Engineering and Computer Sciences. Dr. Butz is the author of *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, the most scientific Revisionist work on the Holocaust to date.

Bezalel Chaim is an Editor of Revisionist Press, scholarly book publishers in New York City which for a decade has published and distributed the writings of the founding fathers of Revisionism, Harry Elmer Barnes and Francis Neilson. Mr. Chaim is currently editing several series of monographs in the areas of Jewish libertarian socialism and anarchism, the history of the Jewish Khazars, and free banking theory. He is also the compiler of an anthology, *Neturei Karta: Voice of Anti-Zionist Judaism* and the editor of a forthcoming work on the Yiddish film. An advocate of Arab-Jewish understanding Mr. Chaim is a member of the Shalom Network, Breira, Jewish Peace Fellowship, Fellowship of Reconciliation and other organizations and individual efforts supporting peace in the Middle East.

Ditlieb Felderer is one of four refugee siblings who were all born in different European countries. He himself was born in Innsbruck, Austria in 1942. The family eventually found refuge in Sweden, where Mr. Felderer now lives with his Filipino wife. In 1959, Mr. Felderer became converted to the Jehovah's Witnesses faith, and went on extensive evangelizing tours of North America. (He has since been excommunicated). He first became interested in the "Holocaust" when researching an article on the treatment of the Jehovah's Witnesses during the war. After comparing the Exterminationist and Revisionist views, he was at once converted to the latter. He now runs his own magazine and publishing house *Revisionist History*, and organizes Revisionist tours of Poland every summer.

Samuel Edward Konkin III was raised in Edmonton, Canada. He gained his B.Sc.(Hons.) in Theoretical Chemistry at University of Alberta in 1968. He also found time to be Campus Chairman of the University chapter of the Social Credit Party. After moving to New York City, he gained his M.A. in 1973 from New York University, and was a Ph.D. candidate in 1975. He later moved to southern California, where he now publishes his own

magazine *New Libertarian*, and is co-ordinator of the Movement of the Libertarian Left. When not involved in left-libertarian publishing, the author finds time to engage in science fiction.

Richard Lawson was born in Plymouth, England, and has been a keen student of political affairs all his life. He is now the editor of *Heritage & Destiny* ($5pa: Box BCM 5766, London WC1V 6XX, England) where this article first appeared.

Charles Lutton teaches History at a small private college in the western United States.

M. Seleshko's article appeared in the Summer 1949 issue of *The Ukrainian Quarterly*, 203 Second Avenue, New York, NY 10003. A book on *Vynnytsia* by an anonymous author, is published by the Institute for Historical Review, price $3.00. It is reviewed in this issue.

Howard F. Stein, Ph.D. is Associate Professor, Medical-Psychiatric Anthropology, in the Department of Community Medicine, University of Oklahoma Health Sciences Center, PO Box 26901, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73190. He has published in such journals as *The American Scholar, Family Process, The Psychoanalytic Quarterly, The Journal of Psychohistory, Ethos, The Journal of Psychological Anthropology, School Review* and *Social Science and Medicine*. He is the author of two books on ethnicity, and is currently at work on a book to be titled *Projection: Interpersonal, Familial, Cultural, Historical.*